



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL
OF
SEMITIC LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES
(CONTINUING HEBRAICA)

VOLUME XXIV

JANUARY, 1908

NUMBER 2

CRITICAL NOTES ON ESTHER¹

BY PAUL HAUPT
Johns Hopkins University

In the following nn. I have not attempted to give all the divergences exhibited by the Ancient Versions; as a rule, I have recorded only variations which throw some light on the Heb. text.* The ancient versions of E are so free and inaccurate (*cf. e. g.* nn. on **3**, 13. 14; **4**, 1. 11. 14; **5**, 13; **6**, 1; **7**, 3. 4) that it would be a waste of time to discuss all discrepancies.

W's† and J's‡ theory that **℥** is more original than **℣** seems to me untenable (*cf. e. g.* nn. on **6**, 1; **7**, 4; **8**, 8). The fact that the text of **℥** does not read like a translation from the Heb. (*cf. however* *πρωὴν πρωῆ*, **6**, 13)|| is easily explained by the popularity of E. As soon as a foreign book becomes popular, the translations become more idiomatic and free.§ If a French play is to be a success in America or England, it is impossible to present a

¹ Preprinted from the forthcoming *William Rainey Harper Memorial Volumes*.

*It might be well to add that I completed the restoration of the Heb. text of E on Oct. 16, 1905, and that I revised it twice, on Aug. 6, 1906, and July 11, 1907. The Critical Notes were begun on Jan. 24, 1906, and finished on the following day; they were rewritten from June 9 to July 13 and on Aug. 4 and 5, 1906. Finally I recast them again from June 4 to July 12, 1907.

†Hugo Willrich, *Judaica* (Göttingen, 1900) p. 15; *cf.* also p. 27, l. 20. Contrast *Pur.* 28, 15.

‡G. Jahn, *Das Buch Ester* (Leyden, 1901) p. vi.

|| *Cf.* my remarks in *Daniel* 16, 23.

§ Note the adaptations of the proper names in **℥**§, discussed in nn. on **1**, 10. 14 and **9**, 7.

literal translation. It is necessary to introduce additions as well as omissions. I see nothing in \mathfrak{G} that is incompatible with the view that \mathfrak{G} is based on \mathfrak{M} or, to be more accurate, on a recension of the Heb. text from which \mathfrak{M} is derived (*cf. e. g.* nn. on **1**, 10. 14; **7**, 4; **9**, 9). W deems it not impossible that E was intended for Alexandria, and therefore written in Greek; afterwards, he thinks, it may have been translated into Heb. for the use of the Palestinian Jews. But E was written by a Persian Jew about 130 B. C. The Alexandrian festal legend for the Feast of Purim is the so-called Third Book of the Maccabees, and the Book of Judith is a Palestinian Purim legend; see Haupt, *Purim* (Leipzig, 1906) p. 7, ll. 30-38. I cite this book as *Pur.* The first number after *Pur.* refers to the page; the second, to the line. *Cant.* denotes Haupt, *The Book of Canticles* (Chicago, 1902) reprinted from *AJSL* **18**, 193-245; **19**, 1-32. In the same way *Ecc.* is used for Haupt, *Ecclesiastes* (Baltimore, 1905) and *Nah.* for Haupt, *The Book of Nahum* (Baltimore, 1907) reprinted from *JBL* **26**, 1-53.

The unabbreviated names of Biblical Books printed in *Italics* (e. g. *Kings*, *Psalms*, &c) denote the critical notes on the Heb. text in SBOT, i. e. my edition of *The Sacred Books of the Old Testament*; the first number after the name of the Book refers to the page in SBOT, the second indicates the line. Thus *Genesis* 50, 9 refers to p. 50, l. 9 of the critical edition of the Book of Genesis in SBOT; but Gen. **50**, 9 means chapter 50, verse 9 of the Book of Genesis. In the references to SBOT the (unabbreviated) names of the Books are printed in *Italics*; in the references to the received text of the Heb. Bible the names of the books are abbreviated, but not *italicized*, and the numbers of the chapters are printed in heavy-faced figures (**1**, **2**, **3**, &c).

I use \mathfrak{G}^V for $\mathfrak{E}\sigma\theta\eta\rho\beta$ in L's edition (= A in Fritzsche's edition) and \mathfrak{G}^L for $\mathfrak{E}\sigma\theta\eta\rho\alpha$ (= B in Fritzsche's edition). \mathfrak{T} denotes the first Targum in L's edition; $\mathfrak{T}^2 = \text{תרגום שני}$ (the numbers after \mathfrak{T}^2 refer to the pages and lines of L's edition). The apocryphal additions to E in \mathfrak{G} are cited according to the cc. and vv. of the Vulgate (\mathfrak{J}) e. g. **11**, 2 = \mathfrak{G}^V **1**, 1. This corresponds to the numeration in the Authorized Version (AV).

In addition to these symbols note the following abbreviations:

AG²=Delitzsch, *Assyr. Grammatik* (Berlin, 1906).—AJP=*American Journal of Philology*.—AJSL=*American Journal of Semitic Languages*.—AoF=Winckler, *Altorientalische Forschungen*.—AOG=Winckler, *Der alte Orient und die Geschichtsforschung* (Berlin, 1906)=MVAG 11, 1.—ASKT=Haupt, *Akkadische und sumerische Keilschrifttexte* (Leipzig, 1881).—AT=*Altes Testament*.—AV=Authorized Version.—AV^m=Authorized Version, margin.—B=Bertheau, *Die Bücher Esra, Nechemia und Ester*, second edition (Leipzig, 1887) by Victor Ryssel.—BA=*Beiträge zur Assyriologie* von Delitzsch und Haupt.—BAL=Haupt, *Beiträge zur assyrischen Lautlehre*=*Nachrichten von der Kgl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, April 25, 1883.—BDB=Francis Brown (assisted by S. R. Driver and C. A. Briggs) *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the OT* (Boston, 1906).—BL=Haupt, *Biblische Liebeslieder* (Leipzig, 1907).—BT=L. Goldschmidt, *Der babylonische Talmud*.—C=Paulus Cassel, *Das Buch Esther* (Berlin, 1878).—c.=chapter; cc.=chapters.—Cant.=Haupt, *The Book of Canticles* (Chicago, 1902) reprinted from AJSL 18, 193-245; 19, 1-32.—Ch=Cheyne.—CV (i. e. *Congress-Vortrag*)=Haupt, *Die akkadische Sprache* (Berlin, 1883).—DB=Dictionary of the Bible.—E=Esther.—EB=*Encyclopædia Biblica*, edited by Cheyne and Black.—Eccl.=Haupt, *The Book of Ecclesiastes* (Baltimore, 1905) reprinted from AJP, No. 102.—G=Greek Bible (LXX).—G^A=*Alexandrinus*.—G^L=Lucianic recension edited by L (Göttingen, 1883).—G^S=*Sinaiticus*.—G^V=*Vaticanus*.—GB¹⁴=Gesenius' *Hebr. Handwörterbuch*, edited by Buhl, fourteenth edition (Leipzig, 1905).—GK²⁷=Gesenius' *Hebr. Grammatik*, edited by K (Leipzig, 1902)—English translation of GK²⁶ by Collins and Cowley (Oxford, 1898).—H=Haman.—HW=Delitzsch, *Assyr. Handwörterbuch* (Leipzig, 1896).—IN=Ed. Meyer, *Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme* (Halle, 1906).—J=G. Jahn, *Das Buch Ester* (Leyden, 1901).—J (i. e. Jerome)=Vulgate.—JAOS=*Journal of the American Oriental Society*.—JBL=*Journal of Biblical Literature*.—JHUC=*Johns Hopkins University Circulars* (Baltimore).—K=Kautzsch (especially his *Textbibel*).—1 K, 2 K=The first (second) Book of the Kings.—KAT³=Eb. Schrader, *Die Keilinschriften und das AT*, third edition, edited by Zimmern und Winckler (Berlin, 1903).—KB=Eb. Schrader, *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*.—L=Lagarde.—l.=line; ll.=lines.—LB=Luther's Bible.—LOT=S. R. Driver's *Introduction to the Literature of the OT*.—M=Mordecai.—1 M, 2 M=

*It might be well to add that the references to C were inserted after I had completed the revision of my manuscript, in July, 1907. Some etymologies proposed by C are impossible, but several of his remarks are superior to the observations found in the leading commentaries.

The first (second) Book of the Maccabees.—**MT** = Masoretic Text.—**MDOG** = *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft* (Berlin).—**MSS** = Manuscripts.—**MVAG** = *Mitteilungen der vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft* (Berlin).—**N** = Nöldeke.—**n.** = note; **nn.** = notes.—**Nah.** = Haupt, *The Book of Nahum* (1907) = *JBL* **26**, 1-53.—**NT** = New Testament.—**O** = Oort, *Emendationes* (see *Proverbs* 69, 4).—**OLZ** = *Orientalistische Literatur-Zeitung*, edited by Peiser.—**OT** = Old Testament.—**p.** = page; **pp.** = pages.—**Pur.** = Haupt, *Purim* (Leipzig, 1906) = *BA* **6**, part 2.—**R** = Ryssel (especially his edition of B and his critical **nn.** in the *Beilagen* to K's *Die Heilige Schrift des AT*).—**S** = Siegfried, *Esra, Nehemia und Esther* (Göttingen, 1901).—**1 S**, **2 S** = The first (second) Book of Samuel.—**Š** = Syriac Version (*Peshita*).—**Š^A** = *Ambrosianus*.—**SBOT** = Haupt, *The Sacred Books of the OT*.—**SD** = Haupt, *Über einen Dialekt der sumerischen Sprache* = *Nachrichten von der Kgl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, Nov. 3, 1880.—**SFG** = Haupt, *Die sumerischen Familiengesetze* (Leipzig, 1879).—**SG²** = Nöldeke, *Syrische Grammatik*, second edition (Leipzig, 1898).—**Ƨ** = Targum.—**Ƨ²** = **תרגום שני**.—**TBAI** = Cheyne, *Traditions and Beliefs of Ancient Israel* (London, 1907).—**THCO** (*i. e.* Transactions of the Hamburg Congress of Orientalists) = *Verhandlungen des xiii. Internationalen Orientalisten-Congresses zu Hamburg*, 1902 (Leyden, 1904).—**v.** = verse; **vv.** = verses.—**VG** = Brockelmann, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen* (Berlin, 1907).—**W** = Willrich, *Judaica* (Göttingen, 1900).—**Wd** = Wildeboer's commentary on E in *Die fünf Megillot* (1898) = part xvii of K. Marti's *Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum AT*.—**WdG** = *A Grammar of the Arabic Language*, by W. Wright, third edition revised by M. J. de Goeje (Cambridge, 1896).—**Wn** = Winckler (especially his paper on E in *AoF* **3**, 1-64, Leipzig, 1901, whole number xvi).—**ZA** = *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*.—**ZAT** = *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*.—**ZDMG** = *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*.—**ZK** = *Zeitschrift für Keilschriftforschung*.

A scholar who considers the Moabite stone to be metrical may discuss the poetic form of E;* but so far as I can see, it is written in prose, just as Ruth and Jonah are (apart from the Maccabean psalm inserted in c. **2**; see *AJSL* **23**, 256).

For **אִשְׁתָּר** = Ištar, a feminine form of Ašur, *Benignus*, so that E = *Benigna* (cf. Lat. *Bona Dea*) see my paper *The Name*

* Cf. the remarks of Cornill and Ed. Meyer cited in *AJSL* **23**, 221; also Budde, *Geschichte der althebr. Litteratur* (Leipzig, 1906) p. 33.

Istar in JAOS 28, 112–119; and for the Herodotean prototype of E and Sheherazade (*Φαιδραμίνη*, Her. 3, 68) see *Pur.* 8, 21 (cf. 40, 20). *Ἦ* (241, 16) says of E: אִתְּחַרִּי שְׂמָה אַחֵר בְּשֵׁם כּוֹכַב נִגְהָא יוֹנִית אִסְתִּירָא.

א

(1) *אִתְּחַרִּי שְׂמָה אַחֵר* is a corruption of *אִתְּחַרִּי שְׂמָה אַחֵר* = Old Pers. Khšayārša. It is not necessary to suppose that *אִתְּחַרִּי שְׂמָה אַחֵר* (اخشوارش) became *אִתְּחַרִּי שְׂמָה אַחֵר* (*Kings* 126, 47; 270, 22) and that the ו and ר were afterwards transposed, while the י was corrupted to ו. The name *אִתְּחַרִּי שְׂמָה אַחֵר* does not appear as *אִתְּחַרִּי שְׂמָה אַחֵר*.

For the transposition of the vowels cf. *אִתְּחַרִּי שְׂמָה אַחֵר* (3, 12) for *אִתְּחַרִּי שְׂמָה אַחֵר* = Old Pers. *khšatrapāvan*, also *מִרְדָּךְ* for *מִרְדָּךְ* (see n. on *מִרְדָּךְ*, 2, 5) and *מִרְדָּךְ* for *מִרְדָּךְ*, *אַרְחִשְׁמִי*, Assyr. *Araxšāmna*; see *Pur.* 23, 15; * cf. *L., Purim*, p. 52, below.

The first ו of *אִתְּחַרִּי שְׂמָה אַחֵר* is a corruption of י, the second ו is due to dittography of the ר; cf. the dittographed ו in *בְּתוֹרָה* and *תַּעֲבוּרִי*, *Ruth* 2, 8; 3, 14; also *לַעֲבוּרֵיכֶם*, *Nah.* 2, 1 (see *Nah.* 29, below) and *פְּרוּזִים* = *פְּרוּזִים* (9, 19). The letters ו and י as well as ו and ר are often confounded, dittographed and haplographed (*Pur.* 51, 22). For ו and י cf. *E* 8, 13; *Ruth* 2, 1, and *Kings* 259, 29. *אִתְּחַרִּי שְׂמָה אַחֵר* reads correctly *אִתְּחַרִּי שְׂמָה אַחֵר*, just as we find in an Aramaic inscription: *חֲשִׁי־אַרְשֻׁ*, corresponding to the Babyl. *Xiši'aršu* (-i, -a) or *Axši'aršu* (x = ח).

For confusion of ו and ר (ד) cf. my remarks on *רָמָה בִּים* *קֹס וְרַכְבִּי* instead of *קֹס וְרַכְבִּי* and *קֹס וְרַכְבִּי* † for *וְרַכְבִּי* (Ex. 15, 2) in *AJSL* 20, 158, below (see also 23, 225, below). The suffix in *קֹס וְרַכְבִּי* † is due to dittography of the initial ר of the following *רָמָה*. In the gloss 2 K 16, 10 we find *דְּרַמְשֶׁק* for *דְּרַמְשֶׁק*; in *Job* 41, 21 (a variant to v. 20) *תוֹתָחַ* stands for *תַּרְתָּח* = Assyr. *tartaxu*, *shaft*, *arrow* (KB 6, 328). In *E* 1, 16; 2, 21; 3, 12; 8, 10 we find *אִתְּחַרִּי שְׂמָה אַחֵר*; in 10, 1: *אִתְּחַרִּי שְׂמָה אַחֵר*. The form *אִתְּחַרִּי שְׂמָה אַחֵר* (اخشوارش) is more correct than *אִתְּחַרִּי שְׂמָה אַחֵר*, although the first ו is a corruption of י. In *אִתְּחַרִּי שְׂמָה אַחֵר* the omission of the ו (for י) before ר is due to haplography; similarly ר has been omitted before ו in *הַפֶּרֶר* (for *הַפֶּרֶר*) *E* 7, 8, and *Ἰ* (*δαμάει*, *مدمعا*)

* Cf. also *מַבְּבִל* = Assyr. *abūbu* (*Nah.* 31) and modern Arab. *qaba-jūr* for French *abat-jour* (VG 1, 121, below).

† For *נָאֵד = נָאֵד* to praise cf. Eth. *ገላገ*: (AG², §146).

‡ IN 23 Ed. Meyer still renders: *Ross und Reiter*; he also maintains the pre-Exilic date of Moses' Song of Triumph. He agrees with me, however, in stating (p. 49, below) that there is some historical nucleus in the story of the catastrophe of the Egyptians; cf. my remarks in *AJSL* 20, 149. 153. 154. 158.

read פרוּת instead of פְּרוּת, Joel 1, 17; פּוּרִים must be derived from פּוּרִי = פּוּרִי ; see n. on 9, 26.

In 27 out of the 29 cases in which the name אֲחִישִׁירַשׁ occurs in E it is due to scribal expansion; cf. especially 1, 15. 16; it is original only in the opening clause 'וְיָדָהּ בִּימֵי א' (1, 1) and in the phrase 'מַלְכוּת א' (3, 6;—9, 30 is a gloss). Wherever we find דָּוִד הַמֶּלֶךְ or הַמֶּלֶךְ שְׁלֹמֹה (GK²⁷, § 131, g) either the name or the title is due to scribal expansion. The proper Eng. phrase is *King David*, the proper Heb. expression is דָּוִד הַמֶּלֶךְ. *The king David* is neither good Eng. nor good Heb. The proper names (David, Solomon, Rehoboam, Jehoram, Jehoash, Rezin, Josiah) must be omitted *e. g.* in 1 K 1, 32. 37; 5, 27; 8, 5; 9, 11; 12, 6. 18; 2 K 3, 6; 14, 11; 16, 6. 11. 17; 22, 24; 23, 29,* while the omission of the title *king* is required *e. g.* in 1 K 1, 53; 2, 29; 10, 16. 21. 23; 2 K 16, 11. 16; 25, 8. Even in cases where הַמֶּלֶךְ is affixed to the proper name, the title may often be omitted; cf. *e. g.* 2 K 9, 15 and Stade's nn. (in *Kings*) on the passages cited above.

It is often stated that the name of God is never mentioned in E (cf. n. on 4, 14) while the King of Persia is referred to 187 times, and his kingdom 26† times; cf. *e. g.* W 27 and Hastings' DB 1, 733, footnote. S (137, n. 1) remarks that the King is mentioned 190 times. I find that the name אֲחִישִׁירַשׁ occurs 29 times, while he is simply referred to as the King 193 times. This would be 222 times, not 187. In several passages, however, the title הַמֶּלֶךְ does not refer to Xerxes in particular, but means *royal* in general.

Ⓔ has for אֲחִישִׁירַשׁ the name of his son Ἀραξέξερξης (cf. *Ezra* 32, 5). This discrepancy is not striking if the name אֲחִישִׁירַשׁ is a later addition in all the passages except 1, 1 and 3, 6 (see above). Ⓔ Ἀσσηρος is a later correction, just as Ⓔ Ουσσιν for Ⓔ Ἀσιν. Ⓔ reads, at the beginning of the parenthesis, אֲחִישִׁירַשׁ. According to AoF 3, 5 אֲחִישִׁירַשׁ is Cambyzes, and the conspiracy in 2, 21 was aimed at Cyrus (cf. below, ad 2, 21) but King אֲחִישִׁירַשׁ in E represents Alexander Balas (see *Pur.* 29, 8; 35, 42) i. e. the *poor and wise youth* alluded to in Eccl. 4, 13 (for *poor*=humble, of mean birth, of low origin, see *AJSL* 23, 226, n. 13).

The parentheses are a characteristic feature of E (cf. *Pur.* 9, 6). We find a great many explanatory parentheses in Herodotus; cf. *e. g.* Holder's edition where the parentheses are enclosed in () while glosses are enclosed in []. As E was written about B. C. 130, the Sadducean author may have read Herodotus' work, just as the Sadducean author of Ecclesiastes may have been acquainted with the works of Epicurus

*This must not be interpreted to mean that all proper names, or titles, that might be dispensed with should be canceled, even if they are omitted in some of the Ancient Versions.

† This is correct only if we include מַלְכוּת in 1, 19; 4, 14; 5, 1, where it refers to E.

and other Greek philosophers (*Eccl.* 6, n. 7). I have indicated the parentheses by () *e.g.* vv. 13. 14; 2, 5. 12; 5, 7. Transpositions are indicated by { } and [] *e.g.* v. 6, not by ().

For הָהִי we would expect הָהִי or הָהִי (*cf.* אֶסְתֵּר for אֶסְתֵּר, הָרָאָה for הָרָאָה, &c) corresponding to Syr. ܗܗܝ, Arab. هند Hind. 𐤇 has הָהִי, but 𐤇 ܗܗܝ ܠܗܡܢܐ. In l. 14 of the inscription of Darius at Naqs-i-Rustam the name appears as Indû. The accent of הָהִי should be on the ultima, not on the penult (הָהִי, הָהִי, הָהִי, not הָהִי). B thought that the pointing הָהִי might have been influenced by וְהָהִי, but these two words are not the only *segholate* (see *Proverbs* 67, 19) forms (לֹא; *cf.* שָׁחַד, &c. The o in הָהִי instead of i or e may be explained in the same way as in נָא = Assyr. Ni', *Thebes*; see *Nah.* 30 and *cf.* my *Assyr. E-vowel*, p. 22. It is possible that the Heb. o was pronounced ô, just as the Assyr. u seems to have been sounded as ü; see *Ezekiel* 64, 43.

(2) The prefixed הָהִי is due to scribal expansion.

According to AOG 21 כִּשְׁבַת הַמֶּלֶךְ עַל כִּסֵּא מַלְכוּתוֹ means, not *when the King sat on his royal throne*, but *when he acceded to the throne*. The beginning of the following verse, however, shows that the great banquet was given, not at the accession of the King, but in the third year of his reign. W (16, above; *cf.* 21, below) referred Ἐθρονίσθη (several MSS have ἐνεθρονίσθη) to the solemn enthronization of the King, which may have been celebrated three years after the accession of the King (*cf.* Jacob, ZAT 10, 281). The German Emperor William I. succeeded his elder brother Frederick William IV. on Jan. 2, 1861, but his coronation was celebrated at Königsberg on Oct. 18, 1861. Ἐθρονίσθη (which is a free translation of כִּשְׁבַת הַמֶּלֶךְ עַל כִּסֵּא מַלְכוּתוֹ) may refer to the enthronization (*cf.* ἐν αὐταῖς ταῖς ἡμέραις) but this is not the original meaning of ἔθ. *Cf.* also E 5, 1 and Herod. 7, 102; Plut. *Themist.* c. 13.

Heb. בִּירָה (𐤁𐤓𐤇, 𐤁𐤓𐤇) is a Babyl. loanword = birtu, *citadel* (HW 185^a). 𐤁𐤓𐤇 הַבִּירָה denotes the Acropolis of Susa; so, correctly S. *Cf.* my remarks on the Acropolis of Nineveh (*Nah.* 44). The royal palace was situated in the Acropolis (C 13, below) not in the city. The city was separated from the Acropolis by the Choaspes; see n. on 4, 17. Ἐθ^{VI}, incorrectly, ἐν Σούσοις τῇ πόλει. Contrast הָהִי שֹׁשֶׁן (at the end of c. 3) and בְּרָחוֹב הָהִי (6, 11). See also n. on 9, 6.

(3) Before הָהִי we must insert וְשָׁרִי; so R (in K) and S.

For הָהִי הַפְּרָתִים = Assyr. paršûmûti (HW 546) = זְקִנִּים *cf.* AJP 17, 490.

(4) The statement (AoF 3, 31, n. 1) that the original meaning of this passage was undoubtedly that the King gave a banquet *after* having displayed his power is untenable; בְּרָחוֹב הָהִי cannot mean *after having*

shown. Neither Θ^v καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα μετὰ τὸ δεῖξαι αὐτοῖς nor Θ^L εἰς τὸ ἐπι-
δειχθῆναι (\mathfrak{I} ut ostenderet) are correct. The emendation בהראתם is
gratuitous.

The 180 days may be an exaggeration, just as the 10,000 talents
(3, 9) or the 50 cubits (5, 14) or the 75,000 said to have been slain by the
Jews (9, 16) but the author undoubtedly intended to convey the idea
that the banquet lasted 180 days, *i. e.* half a year.

מַלְאִי יָמִים רַבִּים is a corrective gloss (or variant; cf. *Adap Nisan* in
 Θ^L 3, 7 and *Kings* 213, 48; 291, 4; *Nah.* 40, 5; also n. on וַאֲבַנְתָּה v. 10,
and n. on 8, 6) to the following שְׁמוֹנִים וּמֵאָה יוֹם; it is omitted in
 Θ^{VL} . The glossator may have considered the 180 days an exaggeration;
cf. second n. on 6, 8.

(5) K^{ethiv} וּבְמִלְאוֹת, Q^{ere} וּבְמִלְאוֹת. The form is based on the
analogy of the verbs לָדָה, the מ is silent; cf. סֹאן (Is. 9, 4) *i. e.*
סֹן = סָאן = סָאן = Eth. ሥፋን: šān; see *Isaiah* 88, 39; *Kings* 274, 19;
280, 48.

מַלְאִי מִנְעֵר וְעַד קֶטֶן means both high and low, not old and young;
the latter phrase is expressed by מִנְעֵר וְעַד זָקֵן (3, 13). B interprets
מַלְאִי מִנְעֵר וְעַד קֶטֶן correctly in the present verse; but in v. 20 he takes
it to mean old and young.

Instead of מִשְׁתָּה it is better to point מִשְׁתָּה; cf. ψ 60, 5 and
Kings 173, 8. The צִיר in this case indicates an accented short *e*; see
below, n. on v. 22; contrast THCO 209.

In חֲצֵר (חֲצֵר חֲצֵר חֲצֵר) בַּחֲצֵר גִּנַּת בֵּיתָן הַמִּלְךְ the
חֲצֵר is according to Wn a gloss to גִּנַּת בֵּיתָן; but this is impossible.
 Θ^v ἐν αὐλῇ οἴκου τοῦ βασιλέως omits גִּנַּת; Θ^L has ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ τοῦ
βασιλέως. The feast was not given in the park: this would have ruined
the park; it was given in the forecourt of the royal park. This fore-
court (*D* in the groundplan of the Acropolis of Susa in Billerbeck's
Susa, p. 132) had a mosaic pavement. A mosaic pavement in the park
(*B*) would be very strange. Nor is E's banquet (c. 7) given in the גִּנַּת
בֵּיתָן; the King goes from E's banquet to the park (7, 7) and returns
from the park to the place of the banquet (7, 8). According to Ch (EB
4500) בֵּיתָן is a corruption of בִּטְנִי: it was an orchard of pistachio
nut-trees that was meant! It might just as well be explained as a slight
modification of יִרְחֵמָאֵל! But בֵּיתָן is a Babyl. loanword (KAT³, 649)
derived from bitānu, palace. Cf. tarbaçu ša bitāni in Behrens,
Briefe kultischen Inhalts (Leipzig, 1906) p. 39, n. 3. The idea (AoF
3, 2) that בֵּיתָן is an ideogram with phonetic complement (*n* + בֵּית =
appadan or maethana)* is impossible; see *Pur.* 48, 10. The punctu-

* Cf. N, *Aufsätze zur persischen Geschichte* (Leipzig, 1887) p. 132 and my ASKT 165,
below.

ation **ביתן** is just as wrong as the vocalization of **כרפס** (v. 6) and **אבדן** (8, 6). Cf. also **יצע** for **יצע** (4, 3).

(6) **הור** is an explanatory gloss to the following Pers. loanword **כרפס** = *κάρπασος*. A second explanatory gloss to **כרפס** is **בוץ** which must exchange places (cf. n. on 3, 11) with **ותכלת**. The transposition of **בוץ** and **תכלת** is probably due to 8, 15 where we find **בוץ וארגמן**; cf. the remarks on **קרה**, **ביום קרה** (Nah. 3, 17) in *Nah.* 33. For **ארגמן** and **ותכלת** cf. my remarks in THCO 220. Both terms are Babyl. loanwords (KAT³, 649, n. 2). The prefixed gloss **הור** explains the color of the **כרפס**, while the affixed gloss **בוץ** describes the fine quality of the velarium (*ἑ^τ σκακη^η τεταμένη*, cf. *ἦ et pendebant . . . tentoria*, *הור* *פריסן יריסן*, *פריסן יריסן*, *פריסן יריסן*). Cf. *carbasus* Lucr. 6, 109.

For **כרפס** with ä (as in *κάρπασος*) we must point **כרפס** = Pers. *کرپاس*, Syr. *ܟܪܦܣܐ*; cf. conclusion of n. on v. 5, also *Daniel* 21, 19.

Before **כרפס** we must insert the preposition **תחת**; this was probably displaced by the gloss **הור**; cf. n. on **ואבנתא** (instead of **תריש**) in v. 10 and n. on 3, 11; also *Nah.* 25 (ad 1, 11). There is a certain graphic similarity between **הור** and **תחת**; not only **ו** and **ר** are confounded (see above, ad v. 1) but also **ו** and **ת**: in **בלו** (*Ezr.* 4, 13, 20; 7, 24) e. g. the feminine **ת** of the Babyl. term *biltu* (from **רבל**) has been corrupted to **ו**; the original form may have been **בלת**; cf. *Eth.* **בִּלְתִּי**: *bēnát* (*JAOS* 13, lii, below; *JBL* 19, 77, below). On the other hand we find **ת** for **ו** in **ושתני = שתני**; see *Ezra* 63, 2; cf. *Ὀσράνης* (**אוסתן**) *Sachau, Drei aram. Papyrusurkunden aus Elephantine* (Berlin, 1907) pp. 26, 33; for **מדה ומה = מאומה** cf. **אוסתן** cf. *Kings* 118, 1. Contrast *L, Pur.* 52, below; also *Βισθάνης* (*Arrian* 3, 19, 4).

It is impossible to regard vv. 6, 7, with B and Wb, as exclamations; nor can we, with AV, supply at the beginning of v. 6: *where were* (in K's AT *dort gab es*; S *da war*).

אחור does not mean *held, fastened* (*ἑ^τ τεταμένους ἐπὶ σχοινίους*, *ἦ sustentata funibus*, *سُتَنْتَبَ صَقْلًا*) but *bound, bordered, edged*; Ger. *eingefasst*; so B and K; contrast Keil, Schultz, Wb, S (*befestigt*).

גלילי does not mean *rings* (*ἑ^τ κύβοι*, *ἦ circuli*) or *κύβοι* (*ἑ^τVL*) but *poles*; see my translation of Cant. 5, 14 in *AJSL* 18, 199; cf. THCO 234 and BL 10.

Before **מטות** we must insert the preposition **ב**. It is not necessary to say **על-מטות**, as in 7, 8; cf. *AJSL* 22, 201, l. 11.

The terms **והר ושחור** seem to denote four varieties of marble: **שח** (= **שח** 1 Chr. 29, 2) is *white marble* (cf. **שח** = **בוץ**, *byssus*, i. e. *white lawn*; see the third paragraph of the nn. on the

present verse) = Assy. šaššu (*i. e.* šāšu; *cf.* laššu = lāšu = لايس laisa; see *Proverbs* 51, 9.—𐤔𐤁𐤕𐤔, Ἑ σμαραγδίνη may be *smaragdine marble*, *i. e.* probably *verd-antique*.—𐤔𐤁𐤕𐤔, Ἑ ἰννίvos (*cf.* Arab. دُر durr, pearls) may be *lumachelle* or *shell-marble* (Ger. *Muschel-marmor*) which the ancient Persians may have obtained from the neighborhood of Astrakhan; the Astrakhan lumachelle is dark brown with orange shells. *Muschelkalk* (shell-limestone) is called in Assyrian pilu or pûlu = πῶρος; see *AJSL* 23, 259, below; *Nah.* 16, n. 15.—Heb. סַחֲרִית may be identical with Assy. sixru (HW 495^b) which is probably another name for šubû (HW 637^b) = שֻׁבִּי (Ex. 28, 19; 39, 12) rendered in 𐤔𐤁: ἀχάτης; so it may mean *onyx marble* which the Romans called *alabastrites*. Onyx is but a variety of agate. Delitzsch's conjecture (*Proleg.* 85) that šubû = שֻׁבִּי denotes the *diamond*, is improbable.—The meaning of שֻׁבִּי is reasonably certain; the explanation of the three other terms is more or less conjectural.

(7) 𐤔𐤁𐤕𐤔 כִּיד הַמֶּלֶךְ (*cf.* 2, 18 and 1 K 10, 13) is correctly paraphrased in 𐤔: *ut magnificentia regia dignum erat*; *cf.* *Kings* 186, 45.

(8) For כָּתָה see below, *ad v.* 13.

𐤔𐤁𐤕𐤔 לִית דַּאנִּי (𐤔 לִית דַּאנִּי) does not mean *no one urged* (𐤔 *nec erat qui nolentes cogeret ad bibendum*, 𐤔 𐤁𐤕𐤔, AV none did compel) but *no one restricted*; so, correctly, Schultz. *Cf.* the Ithpeel אַחַנֵּס in the Talmudic passages *Ned.* 27^a; *Keth.* 16^b, cited in Jastrow's dictionary; also in Dalman's *Wörterbuch* אַחַנֵּס is explained to mean *gehindert werden*. The stem אַחֵ means *to constrain*; this may mean either *to urge to action* or *to restrain from action*. The stem אַחֵ may be connected with Assy. urāsu, *overseer* (HW 136^b). For the change of *r* and *n* *cf.* נָשָׂא, *to lend* = Assy. rašû; 𐤔𐤁𐤕𐤔 = 𐤔𐤁𐤕𐤔; *cf.* נְבוֹכַדְרֶצַּר (2, 6) = נְבוֹכַדְרֶצַּר and ZDMG 61, 195. But Heb. מִנֶּה does not correspond to Assy. magāru; this verb (HW 392) means originally *to fall down*, to submit (Ger. *sich unterwerfen*) = מִנֶּה ψ 89, 45.

For the ἀπαξ λεγόμενον עַל יִסֵּד *cf.* עַל קִים in 9, 21, 27 and in the gloss 9, 31.

The distributive repetition אִישׁ וְאִישׁ (GK²⁷, § 123, c) is very common in E, just as the parentheses referred to above, in nn. on v. 1; the infinitive absolute instead of the finite verb, discussed below, in n. on הִנְחָה (2, 18) and the use of Aramaic words, mentioned below, *ad* 4, 4; 7, 4; 9, 21, 23; *cf.* also the Aramaic forms and constructions discussed in nn. on 2, 9, 18. For the phrase אִישׁ וְאִישׁ *cf.* מְדִינָה וּמְדִינָה, 1, 22; 3, 12, 14; 4, 3; 8, 9, 13;—עַם וְעַם, 1, 22; 3, 12; 8, 9;—יּוֹם וְיּוֹם, 2, 11; 3, 4;—נְעִירָה וְנְעִירָה, 2, 12;—עִיר וְעִיר, 8, 9, 17.—שָׁנָה וְשָׁנָה, 9, 21, 27;—*cf.* especially 9, 28: מְשַׁפְּחָה וּמְשַׁפְּחָה מְדִינָה וּמְדִינָה עִיר וְעִיר.

According to the Talmud (Meg. 12^a; BT 3, 579) every guest received the wine of his native district (*cf.* \mathfrak{T}^2 224, 23; contrast 237, 5) just as at certain modern entertainments the guests are sometimes asked to order their favorite brand and vintage of champagne (אמר רבי אלעזר אחד ואחד השקרו מייך מדינתו (מלמד שכל אחד ואחד השקרו מייך מדינתו).

(9) \mathfrak{M} ושתני may be identical with the name of the Elamite deity Mašti; see *Pur.* 10, 29. For η = Assy. *m* see n. on סיון (8, 9). *Cf.* also the name ושתני; see n. on v. 6. \mathfrak{T}^2 238, 12 Vashti says: *I am the daughter of Evil-Merodach, grand-daughter of King Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon.* According to Ch (EB 5247) ושתני is a corruption of אשורית, Assur being often used as a synonym for Jerahmeel! *Cf.* Ch's explanations of מרדכי (2, 5) and זרש (5, 10).

\mathfrak{M} בבית מלכותא (\mathfrak{T} בבית המלך. *Cf.* בית המלך, for בבית המלך, 4, 13, and contrast בבית המלכות, 5, 1; בבית המלך, 9, 4; בביתו, 1, 22; see *Kings* 301, 45.

\mathfrak{M} עשתה is pluperfect, as in 2, 1; see *Kings* 247, 16; *cf.* below, וחקרב, v. 14; הדיה, 2, 5; הגידה, 2, 10; ידע, 4, 1, &c.

\mathfrak{M} אשר למלך אהשוורוש is a scribal expansion; אהשוורוש is a tertiary addition; *cf.* above, *ad* v. 1.

(10) The names of the seven chamberlains of the king are just as doubtful as the names of the seven councilors (v. 14) and the names of the ten sons of H (9, 7). The name הרבונה is mentioned again in 7, 9 as הרבונה, with final ה instead of א (*cf.* Ruth 1, 20 &c). The name בנתא seems to be miswritten for בנתא (6, 2) = בנתן (2, 21). *Cf.* the omission of the *n* in \mathfrak{G} Ἀρκεσάιος = \mathfrak{M} כרשנא and מרסנא = מרס (v. 14). The name of the fellow-conspirator of בנתא in 2, 21; 6, 2: תרש was displaced (*cf.* ZDMG 61, 286, l. 18; *Nah.* 25, l. 26; BL 62, n. 50) in the present passage by ואבנתא, which is merely a gloss (or *variant*; *cf.* last n. on v. 4) to בנתא with prefixed ו explicative (*cf.* *Pur.* 15, 31) just as מרסנא seems to be a variant of the preceding מרס (v. 14). But the name תרש is preserved in \mathfrak{G}^s .

\mathfrak{G}^v gives the following seven names: $\mathfrak{A}\mu\alpha\nu$, $\mathfrak{M}\alpha\zeta\alpha\nu$, $\mathfrak{O}\alpha\rho\rho\alpha$, $\mathfrak{B}\omega\rho\alpha\zeta\eta$, $\mathfrak{Z}\alpha\theta\alpha\lambda\theta\alpha$, $\mathfrak{A}\beta\alpha\tau\alpha\zeta\alpha$, $\mathfrak{O}\alpha\rho\alpha\beta\alpha$. The first name, $\mathfrak{A}\mu\alpha\nu$, is a corruption (or adaptation) of \mathfrak{M} מדומן (\mathfrak{T} adds to ממוכן, v. 16: הו המן בר רשיעא (בריה דאנג רשיעא).— $\mathfrak{M}\alpha\zeta\alpha\nu$ = $\mathfrak{B}\alpha\zeta\alpha\nu$ = \mathfrak{M} בזתא.— $\mathfrak{O}\alpha\rho\rho\alpha$ = $\mathfrak{O}\alpha\rho\rho\alpha$ (*cf.* $\theta\acute{\alpha}\rho\rho\oslash\varsigma$ = $\theta\acute{\alpha}\rho\rho\sigma\oslash\varsigma$, and the proper names $\mathfrak{O}\alpha\rho\rho\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\varsigma$ &c) = \mathfrak{M} תרש. In \mathfrak{G}^v the names בנתן ותרש are omitted in 2, 21; 6, 2; but in the apocryphal addition prefixed to the Book (v. 11 = \mathfrak{F} 12, 1) we find $\mathfrak{F}\alpha\beta\alpha\theta\alpha$ καὶ $\mathfrak{O}\alpha\rho\rho\alpha$. \mathfrak{G}^s $\mathfrak{B}\alpha\gamma\alpha\theta\alpha\nu$ καὶ $\mathfrak{O}\alpha\rho\alpha\varsigma$ in 2, 21 is a subsequent addition. $\mathfrak{F}\alpha\beta\alpha\theta\alpha$ is a transposition of $\mathfrak{B}\alpha\gamma\alpha\theta\alpha$ (\mathfrak{F} *Bagatha*) = \mathfrak{M} בנתא; *cf.* \mathfrak{S} אבנותא (see below) = \mathfrak{M} בנתא, and \mathfrak{S} רחבונא = \mathfrak{M} הרבונה, also \mathfrak{S}^A שפירותא = \mathfrak{S}^A שפירותא for פרשנחתא (\mathfrak{M} פרשנחתא) in 9, 7. \mathfrak{G}^L 1, 11 has for \mathfrak{G}^v $\mathfrak{F}\alpha\beta\alpha\theta\alpha$ καὶ

Θαρρα the names Ασταος (*var.* Ασταγος) καὶ Θεδεντος, Josephus (*Ant.* 11, 6, 4) Βαγαθως καὶ Θεοδεστης (= תדש, with ד for ר). The *Vetus Latina* has in 2, 21: *Bartageus et Thedestes*. According to W 19 the original name was Θεόδοτος. But even if Θεδεντος and Θεοδέστης were corruptions of Θεόδοτος, this name would be a Greek adaptation like φρουραι for ΦΟΥΡΑΙ = ΦΟΥΡΑΙ; see n. on 9, 23.—Θ^v Αβαραζα seems to be a corruption of אבנתא (Αβαραζα = אבנתא = אבנתא) just as אבנתא appears in Θ^a as Ζηβαθαθα (*i. e.* אבנתא = אבנתא) and in Θ^v as Βωραζη (= Βωραζη = Βωραθη; *cf.* Ζωσαπα = זרש = גרש, 5, 10).—Θ^v Ζαθολθα (for Ζαθορθα) = אבנתא. —Θ^v Θαραβα (Θ^a Θαβαζ) = אבנתא (Θαραβα = Βαραθα = ברס = ברנס = ברנס; *cf.* § below).

אבנתא does not appear in Θ^v, but Θ^a has instead of Θ^v Θαρρα (for Θαρρα) תרש the name Οαρεβωα which is a corruption of אבנתא. In 7, 9 Θ^v has for אבנתא the name Βουγαθαν which seems to correspond to אבנתא (for אבנתא; see above). Θ^l Αγαθας (*var.* Γαβουθας = Θ^v Βουγαθαν, *cf.* Θ^v Γαβαθα = 3 Bagatha, 12, 1, = אבנתא; also ο Αχραθαίος = Αθαχάιος = התך, 4, 9, and Γαβουζα = Γαζουβα = עזובה, *Kings* 176, 33) may have been influenced by the Greek names Αγαθός, Αγαθος, &c. According to Jewish tradition Harbonah was a good man; he is blessed with M and E after the reading of the Megillah at the Feast of Purim. The transposition in אבנתא may represent a similar adaptation; אבנתא suggested the verbs אָבַח, אָבַח, to have pity and compassion; *cf.* אָבַח, אָבַח, compassionate and merciful; אָבַח, אָבַח, tender-hearted and benign. For ב = מ = פ *cf.* AJSL 23, 235, n. 46; also n. on 9, 9. The name אבנתא suggested destruction; *cf.* אָבַח and אָבַח (SG² § 128, B). *Cf.* the remarks on μονχαίος and βουγαίος in the nn. on v. 14.

§ reads אבנתא, to the eunuchs, instead of אבנתא (for אבנתא *cf.* the remarks on אבנתא = אבנתא) adding after אבנתא the name תרש which corresponds to the third name in Θ^v, Θαρρα. The names in §, after the prefixed אבנתא, are: אבנתא אבנתא. Apart from the preservation of תרש, which is omitted in אבנתא, and the interpretation of אבנתא as אבנתא, to the eunuchs, the names in § are practically identical with those in אבנתא. The differences consist in transpositions and other slight graphic variations (ב for כ &c). For אבנתא §^a has אבנתא. For the transposition אבנתא = אבנתא *cf.* Θ^a Αρκεσαίος = אבנתא, v. 14; Γαβαθα = Βαγαθα = אבנתא; Γαβουθας = Βουγαθαν = אבנתא; also Θ^a Αναμ for Αναμ (3, 1).

3 Mauman, Bazatha, Harbona, Bagatha, Abgatha, Zethar, Charchas follows אבנתא; so, too, ט.

The derivation of קריס from Assyr. ša reši (ZDMG 53, 116) seems to me impossible; for ס = Assyr. ש cf. אסתר = Ištar; see *Kings* 270, 26.

(12) Heb. מֵאֵן, *to refuse* (cf. Syr. ܡܢܐܢ ܠܐ, *it is not tedious to me, I do not mind*, Eth. መሰኑ: mannána, *to reject*; Arab. ممانعة mumā'ana, *deliberation*) may be a secondary Piel derived from the interrogative pronoun מִן, *what?* (cf. Assyr. minū, *how?* and minū, *what?*) i.e. a compound of the interrogative pronoun מִי, *who?* *what?* and the interrogative particle הֵא: nu (cf. n. on 7, 5). Heb. וְחֵמָן meant originally *she said, What!* Cf. AJSL 22, 259 and WdG 1, § 67, d, also וַיֵּהָס (Num. 13, 30) from הָס.

אֶת וְשֵׁתִי is scribal expansion; cf. the remarks on הַמֶּלֶךְ דָּוִד in nn. on v. 1. ℣^v has Αστὺν ἡ βασίλισσα for וְשֵׁתִי הַמֶּלֶכָה; in v. 11 ℣^v has simply τὴν βασίλισσαν for אֶת וְשֵׁתִי הַמֶּלֶכָה.

(13) אֶת דְּבַר means here *procedure*; cf. v. 17 and דְּבַר מִדְּבָרֵי (3, 4) also דְּבַר הַצִּוּמוֹת (9, 31) and דְּבַר הַפְּרִים (9, 32).

In דָּת וְדִין (Ⓣ אוריתא ודינא, Ⓢ ⲃⲉⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲟⲙⲟⲛ καὶ κρίσιν, Ⓝ leges ac iura maiorum, AV *law and judgment*, LB *Recht und Handel*) the term דִּין is not added as an explanation of דָּת (S). The meanings of the two terms are entirely different: דָּת denotes especially a *personal* or *executive act*, while דִּין denotes a *legislative act*; דָּת is a *royal decree* (דְּבַר מַלְכוּת, v. 19; cf. כָּדָת 1, 8; 2, 12; 4, 16 and the last paragraph of nn. on 1, 14) or *edict*, and דִּין means *consuetudinary law* including the *ecclesiastical* (ceremonial, ritual) *law*; in Arabic the term دِين dīn is therefore used for *religion*. The term דָּתִים corresponds to the decisions of the Roman emperors, which were called *decrees* (Lat. *decreta*) and formed part of the *imperial constitutions* (Lat. *constitutiones principum*). Cf. v. 19: יֵצֵא דְבַר מַלְכוּת וַיִּפְתַּח בְּדָתִי פֶרֶס וּמָדִי. Heb. דָּת is a Pers. loanword (cf. *Ezra* 63, 18) and means lit. *what is given* (Lat. *datum*). Heb. דִּין, on the other hand, is a Babyl. loanword (KAT³, 650 below) which may ultimately be, not Semitic, but Sumerian (SD 527, 1). Babyl. dīnu corresponds to Sumer. di=din, just as qanū, *reed* is derived from Sum. gi=gin (CV 9). For the vanishing of final consonants in Sumerian see SFG 49; ASKT 136, l. 7; CV 8; and for the preservation of silent final consonants in loanwords cf. *Pur.* 16, 32 (also גִּנְזָךְ = גִּנְזָךְ).

(14) For אֶת וַיִּקְרַב we must point וַיִּקְרַב, *he caused to come near*, i.e. *he summoned* (cf. Josh. 7, 16; 1 S 10, 20; Jer. 30, 21) or *he had summoned* (cf. the n. on עֲשֵׂהָ, v. 9). S's conjecture וַיִּקְרַב (1 K 5, 7) is not good. ℣^v καὶ προσῆλθεν αὐτῷ (℣^l προσῆλθον) does not presuppose a different consonantal text; the Hiphil וַיִּקְרַב may be

۱۰. فصل

16 and 21.

שֶׁחַר אֲדָמָתָא מֵרִסְנָא, and מֵרִסְנָא before מֵרִסְנָא. ע may have regarded

מֶרֶס as appositive to כְּרִשְׁנָא (= שְׁטַר אֲדֻמָּת תְּרִישִׁי)* and as undeleted corrigendum (*cf.* גִּוֵּב גִּוְּבִי, *Nah.* 35) for מִרְסָנָא. For various spellings of the same name *cf.* *Kings* 275, 29. In \mathfrak{G}^l four of the names of the ten sons of H have dropped out. It is possible, however, that the additional names of \mathfrak{M} in the present passage are due to scribal expansion. *Cf.* also \mathfrak{T}^2 (238, 24).

\mathfrak{S} reads בִּרְנִשִּׁי וְאַשְׁתֵּר וְאַרְמוֹת רְמוֹס תְּרִישִׁי מִסְרִיא מְעוֹכֵן. Here the names תְּרִישִׁי and מֶרֶס are transposed, תְּרִישִׁי appearing after רְמוֹס (= מֶרֶס \mathfrak{M}) instead of preceding it. Apart from the transpositions and other slight graphic variations, the names in \mathfrak{S} are again (*cf.* v. 10) practically identical with those in $\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{T}$. The corruption בִּרְנִשִּׁי (for כְּרִשְׁנָא) is obvious; \mathfrak{S}^A has בִּרְשִׁנִּי. The prothetic א of וְאַשְׁתֵּר is not found in \mathfrak{S}^A ; for אֲרִמּוֹת \mathfrak{S}^A has אֲרִמָּת; for רְמוֹס: מוֹס. See also Marquard, *Fundamente*, pp. 68-73, cited EB 1402, n. 2.

(15) The כֹּתֶךָ פְּסוֹק at the end of v. 14 must be inserted after כֹּתֶךָ at the beginning of v. 15; כֹּתֶךָ (\mathfrak{T} כְּאוֹרִיתָא) belongs to the preceding clause (contrast n. on 2, 6). We must read: הַיֹּשִׁבִּים רִאשֹׁנָה בַּמְּלָכוֹת: כֹּתֶךָ, *who held the first rank in the kingdom according to a (royal) decree (patent).* *Cf.* n. on דַּת וְדִין (v. 13) and כִּי כֵן צִוָּה לוֹ הַמֶּלֶךְ (3, 2). The prefixed כֹּתֶךָ before the question מַה לַּעֲשׂוֹת would be very strange. There is no כֹּתֶךָ before מַה לַּעֲשׂוֹת in 6, 6; nor do \mathfrak{G}^l \mathfrak{I} express it in the present passage. \mathfrak{S} اَعْلَمَ عَنَّا كَيْفَ لَخَصَصَ لَهُ لِمَلِكِهِ is merely a free rendering of מַה לַּעֲשׂוֹת בַּמְּלָכָה. Contrast Ed. Meyer, *Geschichte des Alterthums*, 3, 34.

(16) K^{ethiv} מוֹמִיכֵן; Q^{erê} מִבְּיֹכֵן, as in vv. 14. 21. \mathfrak{G}^v ὁ μονχαῖος, \mathfrak{G}^l βουγάιος, \mathfrak{S} مومحى, \mathfrak{I} Mamuchan. \mathfrak{G}^s Μαμουχαῖος is a subsequent correction for μονχαῖος.

(17) \mathfrak{M} דְּבַר means *procedure, behavior, attitude*; *cf.* v. 13. The following הַמְּלָכָה is not *genitivus objectivus* (GK²⁷, § 128, h; *cf.* n. on 4, 11). \mathfrak{G}^v τὰ ῥήματα τῆς βασιλίσσης, καὶ ὡς ἀντίπε τῇ βασιλεῖ is a doublet; *cf.* the rendering of רָצִים (3, 13) in \mathfrak{G}^l . For the explicative καὶ see *Pur.* 16, 15.† \mathfrak{I} sermo, \mathfrak{T} פתגם גזירת מלכתא (*cf.* v. 19: \mathfrak{T} פתגם דְּבַר מְלָכוֹת = \mathfrak{M} גזירת מלכותא).

For \mathfrak{M} עַל read אֶל; *cf.* 4, 5: אֶל מִדְּכִי (for אֶל) and contrast 7, 7: אֶלִּי (for עֲלִי) also 9, 10: אֶל הַיְּהוּדִים (for עַל). See *Nah.* 20, *ad* v. 9.

The suffix in בְּאִמְרֵם does not refer exclusively to the women; both men and women will say: The King commanded Queen Vashti to

* Assyr. šapātu (HW 684a) = שַׁפַּט or axtu for axtu (HW 273a, l. 2) do not prove interchange of ת and ט; *cf.* n. on טַפְסַר, *Nah.* 35. In חַטָּה = قَتْل = קַטַּל, חַטָּה = טַעָה = טַעָה; שַׁחַט = שַׁחַט = קַשַּׁט, חַטָּה = טַעָה = טַעָה, &c the ט is due to partial assimilation; see AJSL 23, 248, below.

† See also Moses Schorr, *Altbabyl. Rechtsurkunden* (Vienna, 1907) p. 171, below.

appear before him, and she did not come. But even if באמרים referred exclusively to the women, it would not be necessary to substitute באמרים; see *Kings* 83, 35.

(18) For וְכִדְרִי (כְּמִיסַת ט) we must read וְכִדְרִי, *whenever*; cf. v. 22 בלשון for כללשון and 3, 4 (Kethiv באמרים, Q^rê כאמרים) also Nah. 47 (כדרי for בדרי) and כְּרִשְׁנָא for ברנשי, v. 14. The ו prefixed to קצָה is the *Waw apodosis* (GK²⁷, § 143, d) cf. וַיִּגִּדּוּ, 3, 4; וַחֲדָה, 4, 11; וַיִּנְתֵּן, 5, 3, 6; וַיִּנְתֵּן and וַחֲעֵשׂ, 5, 6; 7, 2; 9, 12; וַיִּמְלֹא, 5, 9; וַיִּרְסִי, 6, 14; וַנְהַפּוּךְ, 9, 1; also the gloss in Eccl. 5, 6: כִּי־בִקְרֵב חֲלֻמוֹת, *in many a dream there are vanities*. The phrase וְכִדְרִי בִזְיוֹן וְקִצְהָ means: *Whenever there is contempt* (disrespect, disobedience, on the part of the women) *there is wrath* (on the part of the princes). Heb. בְּדִרְי, *whenever* (Job 39, 25) means lit. *in the sufficiency, abundance, frequency*; for דִּרְי cf. *Proverbs* 61, 6. The Versions did not understand the phrase: ס. וּמִן יִיכּוֹל לְסוּבְרָא כְּמִיסַת הוּךְ דִּין וְרִגּוֹז ט. unde regis justa est indignatio. B's sie werden reden, und zwar nach Genüge Verachtung und Zorn is impossible. AV, *Thus* (shall there arise) *too much contempt and wrath*. Similarly Wd (following R in K) *und nach Genüge Verachtung und Verdruss* (*wird es geben*) and S *und es wird dem entsprechend Geringschätzung und Ärger* (*geben*) but in his nn. S states correctly that the בִּזְיוֹן will be on the part of the ladies, and the קִצְהָ on the part of their husbands.

(19) For the phrases וַיֵּיטֵב בְּעֵינֵי אִם עַל הַמֶּלֶךְ טוֹב (cf. 3, 9) and וַיֵּיטֵב בְּעֵינֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ see *Kings* 137, 17.

The omission of הַמֶּלֶכָה after וַשְׁתִּי is intentional; Ὡ^v, however, has ἡ βασίλισσα instead of וַשְׁתִּי; ס. سَمَامَةُ مَلِكَةٍ. Contrast n. on הַמֶּלֶכָה instead of אֶסְתֵּר in 4, 4.

אַחַר לְרִיעוּתָהּ (ס. لَحْصَةُهَا) means simply *to another woman*; cf. רַעִי 1 S 28, 17 (לְדוֹד is gloss) and Neh. 2, 1 (see *Kings* 74, 7).

אַחַר הַטּוֹבָה בִּמְנָהּ does not mean *who is more beautiful than she* (this would be טוֹבָה מֵרָאָה; cf. v. 11; 2, 2, 3, 7) but *who is better than she*, who is superior to her. Ὡ^v γυναικὶ κρείττονι αὐτῆς, Ὡ^u ἄλλῃ κρείττονι αὐτῆς, Ὡ^v altera quae melior est illa, AV *unto another that is better than she*. The new queen is to be just as beautiful as Vashti, but of a sweeter disposition, not so ill-tempered. The idea of the author was no doubt that Vashti's refusal to obey the King's command was simply due to her bad humor (so, correctly, S, *ad* v. 12) although N (EB 1403) says, It has been well remarked by A. H. Niemeyer that the most respectable character in the Book is Vashti who declines to exhibit her charms before the crowd of revelers. According to ט² (224, 27; 237, 30) the King commanded the Queen to appear *naked* (עֲרִילָתָא) before his guests.

(20) The clause **כִּי רַבָּה הִיא** (omitted in \mathfrak{S}^v ; \mathfrak{S} **يَكْثَرُ، وَكَلَامُ**) is concessive: *although it is great*, however great it be; cf. *Proverbs* 39, 35; *OLZ* 10, 65, n. 3; *Nah.* 39 (*ad Jer.* 50, 11). S renders correctly: *so gross es ist*; but the explanation given in his nn. is not satisfactory (*cf.* n. on 4, 7).

According to B the phrase **לְמַגְדֹּל וְעַד קָטָן** means here, not *noble and mean* (so, correctly, Schultz and S; *cf.* **הַעֲמִימִים** and **הַשְּׂרִירִים**, v. 16) as in v. 5, but *old and young*. \mathfrak{S}^v **ἀπὸ πτωχού ἕως πλουσίον**, \mathfrak{S}^i **ἀπὸ πτωχῶν ἕως πλουσίων**.

(22) Heb. **סִפֵּר** (*i. e.* *séfr*; see *Nah.* 29, below) is an Assyrian loan-word and means originally *message* = Assyrian *šipru*; see *Kings* 198, 47. Assyrian *šapāru*, *to send* is a Šaphel of **פָּר**; see *Nah.* 24, below; *cf.* n. on **שָׁקַל** (3, 9).

The last clause of c. 1, **וּמִדְבַּר כָּלשׁוֹן עִמּוֹ**, which is omitted in \mathfrak{S}^v , is a late gloss; in Meg. 12^b (BT 3, 581) the phrase **שׁוֹרר בְּבִיתָהּ** is discussed, but there is no reference to **וּמִדְבַּר כָּלשׁוֹן עִמּוֹ**. The meaning is: he is to talk plainly to her, as we say *to talk plain English* or *United States*, Ger. *mit dem werde ich einmal Deutsch reden*, French *je vais lui parler français* or *je vous le dis en bon français*; *cf.* my remarks on **أَعْرَبَ**, JBL 19, 66. The modern Yiddish phrase is *mámme lóshen reden*, *to talk in the mother tongue* (*mámme* = *mamma*, *mother*, and *lóshen* = **לָשׁוֹן**, *tongue*). An Alexandrian Jew in such a case talked to his wife, not in Hebrew, but in the language of his people, *i. e.* in plain Greek, just as a Jewish rabbi in Berlin would talk to his wife in such a case, not in Hebrew, but in German; *cf.* the last n. on 8, 9. But **τῇ πατρὶῳ φωνῇ** (2 Macc. 7, 8, 21, 27) does not mean *in der Landessprache* (so Kamphausen in K) but *in the paternal* (or *ancestral*) *language*, *i. e.* *in Hebrew* (or *Aramaic*). The *language of the country* would be **ἡ ἐπιχώριος φωνή**. Lat. *patrius sermo* is in Greek: **ἡ ἰδία γλῶττα**.

Et hoc per cunctos populos divulgari (AV *that it should be published according to the language of every people*) is a guess. \mathfrak{M} **וּמִדְבַּר כָּלשׁוֹן עִמּוֹ** could not have this meaning, even if we pointed **מִדְבַּר** instead of **מִדְבֵּר**. The emendation **וּמִדְבַּר כָּל שְׂוָה עִמּוֹ** (proposed by Hitzig and accepted by Rawlinson, Reuss, Orelli, O, B, R, K; but not by Wd and S) is impossible (*cf.* n. on 5, 11). In the first place, we should expect **כָּל שְׂוָה לוֹ** (*cf.* 3, 8; 5, 12) and even if we read **וּמִדְבַּר כָּל שְׂוָה לוֹ**, it could mean only *and talk what is proper for him*, implying a restriction; **סָהַל סָהֵל** means *it is meet and right*. *To talk as he pleases* would be **וּמִדְבַּר כְּרִצּוֹנוֹ** (*cf.* 1, 8; 9, 5) or **כְּאִתָּהּ** **נִפְשׁוֹ** or **כְּהִפְצָן לְבוֹ**. For **כָּלשׁוֹן** read **בָּלְשׁוֹן**; *cf.* **בְּרִי** for **בְּרִי**, v. 18. \mathfrak{S} **سَمِعَ سَمِعَ** follows \mathfrak{M} . \mathfrak{T} interprets: **מִמְלָכָא** **וּמִתְמַלְל הֵךְ לִישָׁן עֲמִיהָ**; **כְּלִישָׁן גְּבֵרָא** **וּכְמִמְלָל עֲמִיהָ**.

ב

(1) **זכר את ושתי** *he remembered Vashti* means *he could not forget her*; he thought of her with affection and was inclined to reinstate her. The insertion of the negative in **ὅτι οὐκ ἔτι ἐμνήσθη** is just as gratuitous as in Eccl. 11, 9 or in **סֵם חַסֵּד סָפֵף וְיִשְׁמְרֵם** at the end of c. 2; cf. the remarks on **לֹא יִדְרַע מִשְׁמִיךְ עוֹר** in *Nah.* 26.

(3) **את כל נערה** is correct; contrast § and GK²⁷, § 117, d; cf. the three Pharisaic glosses in Eccl. 3, 15: **וְהָאֱלֹהִים יִבְקֹשׁ אֶת־נִרְדָּה**; 7, 7: **וַיֵּאבֶר אֶת־לֵב מִתְנָה**; 3, 11: **נָתַן בְּלִבָּם**; see *Nah.* 32. For **את** cf. *Proverbs* 51, 17. According to B. Luther (in IN 79. 119) **את בת לוי** (Ex. 2, 1) means, not *a daughter of Levi*, a Levitess, but *the daughter of Levi*, so that Moses would be a grandson of Jacob.

For **הֵגֵא** (in the scribal expansion derived from v. 8)* read **הֵגִי**, as in v. 8. **ἢ Egeus**, **ἢ** *Egeus*; **ἢ** *Egeus*, **ἢ** *Egeus*, as though the initial **ה** were the article, while **ἢ** substitutes in the present gloss: *Γωγαίος*, and in the original passage (v. 8): *βουγαίος*. For these two names in **ἢ** see below, ad 3, 1; cf. the remarks on *βουγαίος* = *μουνχαίος* = *ממוכן* in nn. on 1, 14.

(5) For the introductory clause cf. the beginning of the Book of Job. **היה** is pluperfect; cf. n. on **עשתה** (1, 9). We must translate: *Now there had been* (for a long time) *a Jewish man in the Acropolis of Susa*.

The name **מרדכי** is derived from the name of the chief god of Babylon, Marduk (*Pur.* 10, 26) = **מרדך** instead of **מרדך** (with **ד**; cf. **סִרְגֹּן**). Cf. the remarks on the transposition of vowels in nn. on **אהשוורוש** (1, 1). The form **מרדכי**, given in Baer's **מ**, is better than the usual punctuation **מרדכי** (**مردوخای**) but the original pronunciation must have been **מרדכי** (**مردوخای**) = *Mapdoxaíos*, *ἢ Mardochæus*; see *Ezra* 58, 41. **ἢ** combines the name with **מירא דכיא**, *pure myrrh*. **ἢ**, as a rule, prefixes the article, *ὁ Mapdoxaíos*; cf. *ὁ Mounchaíos* = *ממוכן* (1, 14) and *ὁ Ἀχαθαίος* = **התך** (4, 9) also *ὁ Ἀμαν* in **ἢ** (5, 9) where **ἢ** omits the article, and *ὁ Γεζι* = **גחזי** (see *Kings* 192, 23). The Herodotean prototype of M is Otanes; the Maccabean prototype is Jonathan (see *Pur.* 8, 22; 6, 36) but the name M is Babylonian. The author of E would not have given his Jewish hero and heroine (for E = *Ištar* see above, p. 101) names connected with heathen deities, unless M (*ὁ Mapdoxaíos*) and E had been the familiar names of some favorite characters in the popular festal legends and dramatic plays (*Pur.* 38, 31) for the

* Cf. the scribal expansions (derived from 3, 13) at the end of 8, 11 and 8, 3 (derived from 9, 25) also the glosses at the end of 9, 2 and 3 (derived from the end of c. 8) and the two scribal expansions (derived from 9, 22 and 10) in 9, 16. See further nn. on **דברי הימים** and **שמרי הסה** (6, 2) and second n. on 6, 8.

(Babyl. and) Persian New Year's festival (*Pur.* 11, 31). According to Ch (EB 3198) M derived his name, not from Marduk (so, too, C 50, below) but from Jerahmeel: Abihail is most probably a popular corruption of Jerahmeel, Kish = Cushi, and the true name of M may have been Carmeli; cf. the Jerahmeelitish explanations of the names Vashti (1, 9) and Shethar, Tarshish (1, 14) and contrast IN 400, 1.

(6) מֵאֵשׁ יִמִּינִי אֲשֶׁר refers to מִרְדֳּכָי; the סוֹף פֶּסוּק should be after קִישׁ; contrast last n. on 1, 14. The genealogy, בֶּן יֶאִיר בֶּן קִישׁ שְׁמֵי בֶן קִישׁ, is parenthetical. Jair (about 600 B.C.) is M's father; Shimei (about 1000 B.C.) and Saul's father, Kish (about 1050) are two of his famous ancestors; cf. the complete genealogies of M in ט 7, 6; ט² 2, 5. C 52 deems it impossible that Kish in the present passage represents the father of Saul. ט inserts between Shimei and Kish the name of Shimei's father, Gera. Shimei is named, because he considered himself at least as good as David; just as M, the descendant of the first king of Israel, considered himself at least as good as the barbarian H (see ad 3, 4). M is introduced as a descendant of Saul, not as a son of David, because under the reign of the Maccabean princes descendants of David were not *personae gratae* (see *Pur.* 23, 31). For מֵאִיר = מֵאִיר, the Heb. form of the Jewish name *Meier*, *Meyer*, &c, see BA 1, 170, below.

For נְבוֹכַדְנֶצַּר we had better read נְבוֹכַדְנֶצַּר = ♂ Ναβουχοδονοσορ = Babyl. Nabû-kudurri-uṣur. For the correct pronunciation of mispointed cuneiform names see *Kings* 270, 16. The best form is the Kethiv in Jer. 49, 28: נְבוֹכַדְרֶאצַּר. The o of the final syllable seems to be preserved also in נְבוֹכַדְנֶצַּר (Ezr. 2, 1) unless the ך is merely due to dittography of the ר; cf. the remarks on אֶחָשֶׁרֶשׁ (1, 1) for אֶחָשֶׁרֶשׁ. The א (which was assimilated to the preceding consonant; cf. הֶטָא = xiṭṭ = xiṭ', SFG 11, below; VG 127, δ) is found also in the spelling נְבוֹכַדְנֶאצַּר; the ר instead of נ (cf. nn. on אֶסֶס, 1, 8, = Assyr. urāsu) in נְבוֹכַדְרֶאצַּר. The n instead of r is due to dissimilation (contrast Aram. תַּרְיִן for תַּנִּין). We have no right to restore throughout נְבוֹכַדְרֶאצַּר (with ר and א) just as it would be pedantic to substitute in the text of an English author *sycamore* for *sycamore*, or *Nazirite* for *Nazarite*. The omission of the א and the substitution of נ for ר no doubt represent the actual pronunciation. The נ is certainly not due to graphic corruption, while the alleged preservation of the o in the final syllable צַר (Ezra 26, 51) may be due to dittography of the ר.

(7) מֵדָסָה, Myrtle (cf. Μυρρίνη, Μυρτάς, &c) corresponds to the Babyl. xadaššatu, *bride*; for הָ = ח and ס = cuneiform ש see *Pur.* 39, 20.* This name is not given in ♂^{VL}; ♂ *Edissa*; ♂ אֶדִּיסָה. The

*According to TBAI 166. n. 3, הָדָסָה is doubtless derived from אֶשְׁחָר [א]. Cf. Ch's explanation of רֶשֶׁתִּי (1, 9).

stems of Assyr. xadaššatu (with خ) and Syr. ܠܚܬܐܢ (ܠܚܬܐܢ, SG², § 26, B, with ح) are not identical; but Aram. ܠܚܬܐܢ, *myrtle* may be a contraction of xadaššatu (see *Pur.* 39, 23) and ܠܚܬܐܢ may be connected also with Αδασα (= ܠܚܬܐܢ, *Nova*) i.e. the name of the place where Nicanor, the prototype of H (*Nah.* 26, 1; 30, 4) was defeated on the 13th of Adar, 161 B.C. (*Pur.* 9, 26). *Alasa*, the name of the place where Judas Maccabæus was slain, may be an intentional alteration of *Adasa*; see *Pur.* 38, 39.

בַּת הָיוֹן, *the daughter of his uncle* (the brother of his father) means, of course, his *cousin* (cf. the extract from Maqrizî in L, *Purim*, p. 13) not his *niece*. Wd (169, below) calls E *M's cousin*, but in the introduction to c. 2 he refers to her as *M's niece*; so, too, p. 181, l. 10; on p. 186 (*bis*) he calls M *E's uncle*. The same mistake is made by N (EB 1400-7) and S (149, l. 8 from the bottom). Cf. also W 17, 18; C 49, 10; 57, 17; 78, 15. In C 53, 8 E's father, Abihail, is said to be a cousin of M. B (400) has correctly *cousin*, not *niece*. 𐤄^v inserts between θυγάτηρ and ἀδελφοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ the name Αμειναδαβ; see nn. on v. 15.

בַּת הָיוֹן refers to the *figure*; טוֹבַת מַרְאֶה, to the *face*; תָּאֵר cannot be derived from רָאָה, it is a secondary modification of הָוִיר, *turn* in the sense of *form, shape*; cf. n. on הַמְּוִקִי (Cant. 7, 2) AJSL 18, 217. The *a* in תָּאֵר is on a par with the Pathahfurtive. Cf. also *Kings* 167, 37.

Instead of לְבַת (לְבַת לֹר מִרְדֵּכִי) 𐤄^v (ἐπαῖδευσεν αὐτὴν ἑαυτῷ) εἰς γυναικα seems to have read לְבִית. According to Rabbi Meir (Meg. 13^a, quoted C 62, below; J 46, below) we should read לְבִית instead of לְבַת; cf. BT 3, 584 (חָנָא מְשׁוּם רַבִּי מֵאִיר אֵל חֲקָרִי לְבַת אֵלָא לְבִית). The word בֵּית, *house* is used in the Talmud for *wife*. The original form of בֵּית, *house* was ba't, see AJSL 22, 258, below; for bat = bint, *daughter* see *Pur.* 50, 25. 𐤄, correctly, *Mardocheus sibi eam adoptavit in filiam*; 𐤄² נִסְבָּה מִרְדֵּכִי לִיָּה לְבִרְתָּא, 𐤄² نَسَبَتْ مَرْدُخَيْهَ لِيَا لَبْرَثَا.

(9) 𐤄² רִיבְהָל (𐤄² רִיבְהָל; cf. 𐤄² רִיבְהָל tauihahā) does not mean *he hastened* (𐤄² accelerare, 𐤄² سَعَى) but *he took a special interest*; cf. French *s'empresser* (S, betriebe eifrig). The cosmetic treatment could not be *hastened*; a period of twelve months was prescribed by a royal decree (v. 12) and E had to await her turn (v. 15). Nor did Hegai *hasten* to send E her meals; she was not starving. But he took a special interest in E and gave special orders concerning her cosmetic treatment and her meals; cosmetic treatment without proper diet does not help very much. Hegai also devoted special attention to the selection of E's seven maids. His experienced eye saw that E was likely to become queen (contrast C 58, 12).

For the position after the object of the infinitive לַחַת לָהּ (which is more Aram. than Heb.) see K's *Aram. Gr.* §§ 75. 84; GK²⁷, § 142, f, n. 2. Cf. Dan. 2, 46: וּמִנְחָה וּנְיָחוּן אָמַר לְנִסְכָּה לָהּ; — 2, 10: לֹא אִתִּי אָנֹשׁ עַל יִבְשָׁתָא דִּי מַלְתָּ מַלְכָא יוֹכַל לְהַחְיָה; — 6, 24: לַחַת לָהּ מִבֵּית הַמֶּלֶךְ. וּלְדִנְיָאֵל אָמַר לְהִנָּסְקָה מִן גָּבָא. The clause לַחַת לָהּ מִבֵּית הַמֶּלֶךְ, which appears in \mathfrak{M} after הַנְּעִירוֹת הָרְאִיוֹת, is more appropriate after מְנוּחָיָה; \mathfrak{M} לַחַת לָהּ מִבֵּית הַמֶּלֶךְ is probably a misplaced correction of לַחַת לָהּ 1°; cf. *Pur.* 47, 41.

(10) \mathfrak{M} הִנִּידָה is pluperfect; cf. n. on עֲשָׂתָה (1, 9). The objection raised by several commentators, that the Persian officers could not fail to discover E's Jewish extraction, is not valid. The officials in charge of a royal harem pay very little attention to the race and faith of an odalisque; any girl יִפְתָּ הָאֵר וְטוֹבַת מְרָאָה is eligible.* E was not asked any questions; but, at the advice of M, she did not talk of her Jewish extraction, because this might have spoiled her chances of becoming Queen. *¶ quae noluit indicare ei populum et patriam suam* is misleading. See also nn. on 3, 4.

(11) \mathfrak{M} לִפְנֵי הָצֵר means *opposite* (or *in front of*) *the forecourt*, \mathfrak{N} קִדְם דְּרִתָּא דִּי בְּבֵית נְשִׂיאָא, \mathfrak{T} קִדְם דְּרִתָּא דִּי בְּבֵית נְשִׂיאָא. M did not enter the forecourt of the harem; cf. 4, 2. 6. Wd raises the question how it was possible that a man could talk to a girl from the royal harem, and how her Jewish extraction could be kept secret under those circumstances. Similarly N (EB 1401) says that M was able to communicate freely with his niece (contrast n. on בֵּת יְדֵן, v. 7) in the harem. S states: *über die Schwierigkeit, wie M* (S, throughout, Mordehai, as though it were מִרְדֵּחִי! cf. n. on 4, 7) *ohne Eunuch† zu sein im Frauenvorhofe sich blicken lassen durfte und E dort sprechen konnte, geht der spät-jüd. Erzähler leicht hinweg.* The narrator, it may be supposed, knew more about Oriental manners and customs than did S; the author did not overlook this difficulty, but S overlooked \mathfrak{M} לִפְנֵי. M did not talk to E; in. c. 4 E sends Hatach to M, and M sends his answers through this eunuch. If M walked in the place before the forecourt of the royal harem, he could easily get some news concerning the inmates of the harem from the eunuchs. By some diplomatic questions he could even obtain some special information concerning E without revealing the fact that she was his cousin and foster-daughter. He could simply ask, How is that beautiful girl in whom Hegai takes so great an interest? See also n. on 6, 10.

* Cf. e. g. F. Marion Crawford's love story of Old Constantinople: *Arethusa, a Princess in Slavery*, and n. 42 to my lecture on *Ecclesiastes in the Oriental Studies* (Boston, 1894). See also C 63, 3.

† M may have been a eunuch just as Nehemiah; see *Ezra* 67, 10 and *Pur.* 52, 15, also BL 118, 1. 9. Cf. the conclusion of n. on 4, 8.

(12) For the striking similarity of the first clause of this verse (*cf.* also v. 15) and the statement in Herod. 3, 79 see *Pur.* 9, 2. *Cf.* also n. on 4, 13.

The שֶׁמֶן הַמֵּלֶךְ had an antiseptic effect, and purified the skin; the בְּשִׁמִּים perfumed the body; the חֲמִירִים (*i. e.* lotions, rubbing, massage, &c) made the skin white and soft, and improved the figure.

(13) וְהָיָה זֶמֶן בָּחַר means *and then* (Θ *kai* τότε, Τ *καὶ* τότε) although (דְּשִׁלְמִין חָרִי עֲשֶׂר יִרְדֵּחַן שָׂחָא) not *in this condition* (§ סחג) although Wd thinks that it may have this meaning; וְבִבְיָ (4, 16) on the other hand, means *and in this condition*, not *and then*. We find וְבִבְיָ, *and thus* also in Eccl. 8, 10; *cf.* AJSL 22, 255, below; contrast GK²⁷, § 119, ii; GB¹⁴, 174^b. 316^b; BDB 486^b, 3. When one of the new inmates of the harem was sent to the King, she could get anything she required for this purpose, *e. g.* dresses, jewelry, &c. These things were, of course, not provided while she passed from the harem to the palace of the King (as S supposes) but before she left the harem; and when she came back from the King, she was probably obliged to return the jewelry &c to Shaashgaz or Hegai.

(14) וְשֵׁנִי cannot mean *a second time* (B). It does not stand for שְׁנִית (*cf.* n. in Baer's edition, p. 72, below). Nor need we, with S, emend: הַשְּׁנִית (= Θ^v τὸν δεῦτερον) or מִשְׁנֵה. וְשֵׁנִי, *a second* (not *the second*) is a gloss (omitted in §) just as שְׁנִית in v. 19, and גַּם בְּיוֹם in 7, 2, or הַשְּׁנִית in 9, 29; *cf.* the שְׁנִית in Josh. 5, 2. The odalisques who had spent a night with the King were not transferred to another harem, as the glossator supposed; they returned to the same house, but they were henceforth under the care of another chamberlain (Θ^v, however, has Γαι = דָּהִי, not שַׁעֲשֻׁגָּז). They were probably treated with special consideration, inasmuch as any one of them might become the mother of a royal prince.

The name שַׁעֲשֻׁגָּז (Σ Susagazus, § מִלְּמִמָּה) should be pronounced Ša'-šë-gaz, not Sha'ashgaz; just as יַעֲמֹדָה represents ia'-më-dû, not ia'amdû. In the same way שַׁעֲשֻׁגָּז, *linse* should be pronounced ša'-të-néz,* not ša'-aṭ-nez (AJSL 22, 258).

Θ^v has Γαι (not שַׁעֲשֻׁגָּז) also in the present verse; Θ^A Tε for Γε, see *Pur.* 42, 18; *cf.* φαργα for φαστα (9, 7). For Γαι = דָּהִי see nn. on v. 3. The gloss שַׁעֲשֻׁגָּז presupposes the reading שַׁעֲשֻׁגָּז.

(15) וְהָיָה לָהּ לֶחֶם מִדָּגִי אֲשֶׁר לֶחֶם לֹא לֵבַת is a subsequent addition (derived from v. 7 and from the gloss 9, 29) which severs

*According to TBAI 566 שַׁעֲשֻׁגָּז should obviously be שְׁנִיעִירָה, *a Shinarite woman*. On the preceding page Ch states that we must substitute for *Thou shalt not see the a kid in his mother's milk* (Ex. 23, 19) *Thou shalt not clothe thyself with the garment of a Jerahmeelite woman*. *Cf.* Acts 26, 24.

the connection between **לְבוֹא אֶל הַמֶּלֶךְ** and **בַּהֲגִיעַ תֵּר אַחֲרָי**. If the author had intended to give the name of E's father, he would have mentioned it in v. 7. **ט**^v calls E again (cf. nn. on 7) **θυγάτηρ Αμεινδαβ** ἀδελφοῦ πατρὸς Μαρδοχαίου. **ט** Αμεινδαβ = **עֲמִינַדָּב**; cf. Cant. 6, 12 where **ט**^v has **ἕτερό με ἄρματα Αμεινδαβ** for **שְׂמִתְנִי מִרְכֻּבוֹת עֲמִינַדָּב**. For **שְׂמִתְנִי** we must read **שְׂמִתְנִי**, *ye have placed me*; **עֲמִינַדָּב** means *kinsmen of a noble man*; see AJSL 18, 214; BL 26, †. Both **אֲבִיחֵיל** and Αμεινδαβ = **עֲמִינַדָּב** are fictitious names emphasizing the fact that E's father was a distinguished man, an **ابن الاكابر**; cf. the names **מְלִיחָן** and **כְּלִיחָן** in the Book of Ruth.

The fact that E did not ask for anything, but took only what Hegai suggested, does not show her wisdom and her modesty (B) but her superior beauty. S thinks this incident illustrates E's modesty; he adds, however, *zugleich machte ihre Schönheit allen weiteren Schmuck überflüssig* (similarly Wd).

טז **סִרְיָה הַמֶּלֶךְ** seems to be scribal expansion, derived from v. 14.

For **נִשְׂאָה** see *Kings* 119, 24; cf. VG 49, β.

(16) For **טֵבֶת** (Babyl. **ṭēbētu**, stem **ṭebē**)* see my *Assyr. E-vowel* (Baltimore, 1887) p. 11; cf. ZDMG 61, 284, below. For the *tenth* month, *Tebeth*, **ט**^v has the *twelfth* month, *Adar*. In **ט**^s **δεκάτω** has subsequently been corrected to **δεκάτω**, and **Αδαρ** to **Τηβηθ**. **ס** substitutes **חֲדָר** for **טֵבֶת** (**ח** = January, **ד** = December) just as **ס** uses **חֲדָר** for **סִרְיָה** (8, 9).

For **טז** **בִּשְׁנַת שֶׁבַע לְמַלְכוּתוֹ** **ס** has **سبعة ايام**.

(18) For the scribal expansion **אֶת מִשְׁתָּה אַחֲרָי** **ס** reads **مستحضر**.

טז **הַנַּחֲתָה**, **ט**^v **ἀφεσις** (**ט**^l **ἀφέσις**) means neither *rest* (**سَلا**, **ṣ** *requies*) nor *a day of rest, holiday* (B, S) nor *exemption from military service* (cf. **מִשְׁלַחַת**, *discharge from the ranks, furlough*, Eccl. 8, 8, and Her. 3, 67) nor *remission of taxes* (**שבוק כרנא**; so W 16, below; cf. 24 and C 73, 6) but *release of prisoners* (Matt. 27, 15). Demetrius I (162-150 B. C.) promised to release all Jewish captives in his kingdom (1 M 10, 33). If **ט**^v **ἀφεσις** meant *remission of taxes*, it would be an Alexandrian adaptation, just as **ט** **ἐθρονίσθη** (1, 2). Remission of taxes at festive occasions was customary under the reign of the Ptolemies, but not in the Persian empire or in the Seleucidan kingdom. The promises of Demetrius I (1 M 10, 25-45) were extravagant, and Jonathan and his people *gave no credit unto them*. ***Ἀνεσις** (**φόρων**) would be more appropriate than **ἀφεσις**. Oriental kings are, as a rule, loath to relinquish any

* Cf. **ṭēbētu**, *signet* = Heb. **טְבַעַת**; see e. g. Moses Schorr, *Altbabyl. Rechtsurkunden* (Vienna, 1907) p. 117.

taxes; nor would an Oriental monarch ever give 10,000 talents to his grand vizier (see *ad* 3, 11). Release of prisoners, even a general pardon, or amnesty, is less costly.* מִן הַנְּחִיָּה is inf. abs. instead of the finite verb (GK²⁷, § 113, z) as in 2, 3; 6, 9: וְנִחֲוֹךְ; 3, 13: וְנִשְׁלֹחַ; 8, 8: וְנִחְתּוֹם; 9, 1: וְנִחְפּוֹךְ; 9, 16: וְנִחְוֹךְ וְנִחְוֹךְ; 9, 18: וְנִחְוֹךְ and וְעִשָּׂה; cf. *Nah.* 25, below; 27, below, and contrast n. on וְאִבְדָּה (9, 6). The infinitives הִנְחִיָּה, הִצְלִיָּה (4, 14) and בִּקְשָׁה (5, 3; 7, 3) are Aramaic rather than Hebrew. Cf. however Arab. اِرَادَة, اِقَامَة iqāma, &c.

Instead of the singular מִשְׁאָתָא (Wd, S: *Getreidespende*; cf. Jer. 40, 5) we must point מִשְׁאָתָא, *portions* (cf. מִנּוֹת, 9, 19, 22) *i.e.* dishes from the royal table or *messes* (see *Pur.* 47, 11). The nouns מִשְׁאָתָא, מִשְׁוֹאָתָא have often been mispointed in מִשְׁאָתָא; see *Nah.* 42. ³ *ac dona largitus est juxta magnificentiam principalem*; ³ *מִשְׁוֹאָתָא*. B says, מִשְׁאָתָא means according to Am. 5, 11; Jer. 40, 5 *gift of grain or food*. The rendering *gift of food* (ἡ τῶν σίτων θεραπεία, *Xen. Cyrop.* 8, 2, 7; cf. *ibid.* 3 and *Anab.* 1, 9, 25) is correct, but not *gift of grain* (σιτοδοσία). In Jer. 40, 5 מִשְׁאָתָא is preceded by the gloss אֲרִיָּה, *portion, ration*.

A glossator who misunderstood מִשְׁאָתָא to mean *tribute* (cf. 2 Chr. 24, 6. 9)† added the gloss which we find in מִשְׁאָתָא at the beginning of c. 10, where it is connected neither with what precedes nor with what follows, just as we find at the end of the Book of Canticles two disconnected misplaced glosses, *viz.* 12, 13 (belonging to 2, 14) and 12, 14 (which belongs to 2, 17). See remarks on misplaced incorrect glosses in ZDMG 61, 297, l. 20; *Nah.* 43 (vv. 11. 6) and 41; also 30 (v. 4) and 25 (v. 11). Cf. nn. on 3, 7; 9, 16.

According to AoF 3, 26 the King levied the tax after he had repealed the decree to exterminate the Jews, because he wanted the money which H had promised to pay for the privilege of exterminating the Jews. AoF 3, 27 the statement וְהִנְחִיָּה לְמִדְיָנוֹת עֲשֵׂה וְיִתֵּן מִשְׁאָתָא כִּיד הַמֶּלֶךְ is said to be meaningless; it is suggested that we should read instead of לְמִדְיָנוֹת the singular לְמִדְיָנָה, referring to the capital, *i.e.* Seleucia; מִשְׁאָתָא (or מִשְׁאָ) is supposed to be merely a variant of מִס, meaning *impost*; v. 18 is taken to be the introduction to 10, 1, which should therefore be transferred to c. 10, the elevation of E to the queen-ship being the final climax.—This is all gratuitous.

* Even in 1 M 10, 34; 13, 34 ἀφεσις does not mean *remission of taxes* (ἀτέλεια). Cf. 13, 39: ἀφίεμεν δὲ ὑμῖν ἀγνοήματα καὶ τὰ ἁμαρτήματα ἕως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας and 10, 33 where ἀφίημι is used of the release of prisoners; cf. however vv. 29–31.

† The terms מִשְׁאָתָא, מִנְחָה, מִדָּה = Assy. mandattu (for mandantu, from andānu, *to give* = נָתַן, SFG 43, 2) are euphemisms; cf. AJSL 23, 231, n. 27; *Pur.* 47, 31.

(19) VV. 19 f. is not an *ἐπάνοδος* or *retrogressio*, as Grotius says, but a gloss added by some one who deemed it necessary to explain the clause **ובזהקבץ בתולות שנית**. \mathfrak{G}^v omits **וריתן משאת כיר המלך**, also the final clause of the preceding verse, **וריתן משאת כיר המלך**; for **וריתן משאת כיר המלך** \mathfrak{G}^v has $\delta \delta \epsilon \text{ Μαρδοχαῖος ἐθεράπευεν ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ}$, which means, according to W 18, below, *he had a high position at the royal court* (cf. 11, 3; 12, 5) but *θεραπεύειν* may mean also *to pay a visit* (cf. *θεραπεύειν τὰς θύρας τινός*) &c. It is not necessary to suppose that M had an official position at the royal court (cf. C 75, 8; contrast 135, below). He may have been a **שְׁלֻחָנִי** or *τραπεζίτης*, i. e. he may have had a money-changer's table at the King's Gate, i. e. apparently (according to 4, 2. 6) the gateway* leading from the City to the Acropolis; cf. last n. on c. 3. The *King's Gate* of Susa, it may be supposed, corresponded in some respects to the *Propylæa* of Athens. But according to \mathfrak{T}^2 (259, 27) the gate was between the royal palace and the harem (**חצרעא דעלין מבית נשיא ועד בית מלכא**). The translation of **וריתן משאת כיר המלך** (6, 10) in \mathfrak{G}^L *καὶ ποίησον Μαρδοχαίῳ τῷ Ἰουδαίῳ τῷ καθημένῳ ἐν τῷ πυλῶνι* is more correct than the rendering in \mathfrak{G}^v *οὕτως ποιήσον τῷ Μ. τῷ Ἰ. τῷ θεραπεύοντι ἐν τῇ αὐλῇ*.

\mathfrak{M} **שנית** is a tertiary gloss; cf. nn. on **שני**, v. 14, and 3, 7.

(20) This verse contains two tertiary glosses to **ותאמר אסתר למלך בשם מרדכי** at the end of v. 22 (cf. n. on 3, 7).

(21) \mathfrak{M} **משמרי הסך** (\mathfrak{G}^v *οἱ ἀρχισωματοφύλακες*, \mathfrak{J} *janitores*, \mathfrak{S} **נִגְדֵי זָכָי**) seems to be misplaced; it should be inserted in v. 22 (see below). According to 1, 10 (where **חַרֶשׁ** has been displaced by the gloss **ואבגחא**) Bigthan and Teresh were not **משמרי הסך**, but belonged to the **פני המלך**. There is a difference between chamberlains and members of the body-guard.

Heb. **סָק** is a loanword = Babyl. *sippu*; for **סָק** instead of *sippu* cf. the remarks on **בַּת**, *daughter* = *bint* in nn. on v. 7.

According to AoF 3, 5 the discovery of the conspiracy is out of place in this connection; it should have been given in the beginning, as in \mathfrak{G} . This theory, however, is gratuitous. Cf. the last but one paragraph of nn. on **אחשורוש** (1, 1).

(22) \mathfrak{M} **ותאמר אסתר למלך בשם מרדכי** cannot be the original reading, although the Ancient Versions have practically the same text: \mathfrak{G}^v *καὶ ἐδηλώθη Μαρδοχαίῳ ὁ λόγος, καὶ ἐσήμανεν Εὐσθηρ, καὶ αὐτὴ ἐνεφάνισεν τῷ βασιλεῖ τὰ τῆς ἐπιβουλῆς*. If we substitute for \mathfrak{M} **ותאמר אסתר למלך בשם מרדכי** the name **להמן**, everything becomes perfectly natural and consistent; see *Pur*.

* Cf. the cut on p 178 of the translation of Ezekiel in SBOT.

We must add at the end of c. 2 the statement **והמלך לא ידע כי מרדכי הגיד להמך**; see *Pur.* 37, 20–43. It is not necessary to say **הגיד את הדבר** (*cf.* 3, 4; 4, 4; GK²⁷, § 117, f). Nor need we substitute **מצא את הקשר** (2 K 17, 4).

ג

(1) For the omission of **המדתא האגגי** after **המך** in the present passage see *ad* 2, 22. \mathfrak{S}^v has simply $\text{A}\mu\alpha\nu$ for **המך בן המדתא האגגי** **צִרְרִי הַיְּהוּדִים** in v. 10; so, too, \mathfrak{S}^l . H represents the name of the principal deity of the Elamites (contrast n. on **מִרְדָּכִי**, 2, 5) Humba, Humman, Amm'an, &c (see *Pur.* 10, 24). The double m of this ancient Elamite (or Susian) name is preserved in certain MSS of \mathfrak{S}^l ($\text{A}\mu\mu\alpha\nu$). Also the name of H's father (**הַמֶּדָּתָא**, \mathfrak{S} 'Αμάδαθος, \mathfrak{I} *Amadathus*) is not Persian, but connected with the name of the chief deity of the Elamites. The initial ה of **הַמֶּדָּתָא** is certainly not the article (LB *Medatha*) *cf.* \mathfrak{S}^v Γαι for **הַגִּי** (see *ad* 2, 3). The u-vowel of Humman appears in Strabo's Ὀμανὸς καὶ Ἀνάδατος (*Pur.* 26, 10). Rawlinson combined H with Ὀμάνης. \mathfrak{S}^A $\text{A}\mu\alpha\nu$ in Tob. 14, 10 is a subsequent corruption or adaptation (*Pur.* 51, 5). \mathfrak{S}^v has there Αδαμ, \mathfrak{S}^S *Nadaβ*. *Nadab* is given also in the *Vetus Latina*, while the Syriac Version has 'Akab; *cf.* EB 5112 and the various readings in Tob. 11, 18.

H is neither Persian nor Hebrew (*Pur.* 12, 16). In the apocryphal letter of the King (16; 10) $\text{A}\mu\alpha\nu$ Ἀμαδάθον Μακηδών (\mathfrak{S}^l ὁ βονγάϊος) is called ἀλλότριος τοῦ τῶν Περσῶν αἵματος (\mathfrak{S}^l φρονήματος) and in M's prayer (13, 12) H is called ὑπερήφανος (*cf.* AJSL 23, 235, l. 6) but in the corresponding verse of \mathfrak{S}^l (5, 15 in L's edition) ἀπερίτμητος. He may have been an officer of the (colored) Susian body-guard of the Persian kings (*Pur.* 38, 5).

הַגִּי (§ $\text{L}^{\circ\circ\circ\gamma}$, \mathfrak{I} *de stirpe* or *de progenie Agag, \mathfrak{T} **מִזְרִיעִית אַגַּג**; *cf.* below) is a subsequent adaptation of the original **הַגִּי**, the *Gagean* or *northern barbarian*; see *Ezekiel* 99, 32. *Cf.* the remarks on ὁ Μουχάϊος = **מִמּוּכִי** (1, 14). In Num. 24, 7 (a Messianic passage added during the Greek period) all the Greek Versions have Γωγ = **גֹּאֲג** instead of **אַגַּג**. In \mathfrak{S}^v the correct rendering of **גֹּאֲג**, Γωγάϊος, which we find in some MSS (*Pur.* 42, 14) of \mathfrak{S}^l has been replaced by βονγάϊος, which is not a *gentilicium* (Βονγάϊος) but the Homeric term of reproach βονγάϊος *braggart*, lit. *boasting like a bull*; see *Pur.* 13. H's contemporary prototype (*Pur.* 12, 3. 9) Nicanor (see *Nah.* 26) was a braggart; *cf.* 1 M 7, 34. 47 and the Talmudic passage Taanith 18^b (*Pur.* 5, 27) also the remark on ὑπερήφανος in the preceding paragraph of the present n. In 5, 12 \mathfrak{S}^l has instead of \mathfrak{S}^v καὶ εἶπεν Ἀμαν, Οὐ κέκληκεν ἡ βασίλισσα κτλ:—καὶ ἐκαυ-
χᾶτο λέγων ὡς οὐδένα κέκληκεν ἡ βασίλισσα κτλ.*

Nicanor is a common Macedonian name. In 9, 24; 16, 10 Θ^v substitutes $\delta \text{ Μακεδών}$ for $\text{הַנְּגִנִי} = \text{הַנְּגִנִי}$. הַנְּגִנִי means *the Agagite*, i. e. *the descendant of Agag*, the king of the Amalekites ($\text{הַמֶּלֶךְ בֶּרֶךְ הַמִּדְבָּרָא דִּי מִזְרַעִית אַגַּג בֶּרֶךְ עַמְלֹק}$) who was spared by Saul, but hewn in pieces before JHVH at Gilgal by Samuel (1 S 15, 33) whereas M is introduced as a descendant of the first king of Israel (see *ad* 2, 6). Josephus, therefore, calls H an *Amalekite*; cf. L, *Purim* 50 and IN 389. The reading הַנְּגִנִי instead of נִגְנִי must have been established in the first cent. B. C.

For $\Gamma\omega\gamma\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma = \text{נֶגַעִי}$ and $\Gamma\omega\gamma = \text{נֶגַע}$ (for נֶגַע) Ez. 38, 2 cf. $\text{טַב} = \text{טוֹב}$ (for טַיִב) *good*; $\text{אֶת} = \text{אֶת}$ (= âiat) *sign*; $\text{אֶתִּי} = \text{Assyr. âti, îati}$, Aram. יְתִי (see *Proverbs* 51, 7) *me*; post-Biblical $\text{נֶאֱדָר} = \text{נֶאֱדָר}$, Assyr. nâdu (AJSL 20, 170) *skin-bottle*; $\text{רֹשׁ} = \text{רֹאשׁ}$, $\Delta\omega\mu\alpha$; (Deut. 32, 32) = $\text{רֹאשׁ} = \text{râš}$, *poison*; $\text{כַּס} = \text{כֶּסֶף}$ (Arab. كأس) *cup*; $\text{לֹא} = \text{לֹא}$, *not*; $\text{זֶאת} = \text{זֶאת}$, Eth. $\text{זֶאת} : \text{zâti}$; מִאֲזִנִּים , *balances*; $\text{מִזְכָּר} = \text{מִזְכָּר}$, *fetter*; $\text{מִזְל} = \text{מִזְל}$ = Assyr. $\text{mâlu} = \text{ma'âlu}$ (stem אָל ; see *Pur.* 17, 1) *front*; $\text{צֶאֱן} = \text{צֶאֱן}$, Aram. צֶאֱן , *flocks*; $\text{רֹאשׁ} = \text{râš, rā'sh}$, *head*; סֶנַּן , i. e. סֶנַּן for סֶנַּן , Eth. $\text{ሰንኅ} : \text{śân}$, Assyr. šēnu , *shoe*; see *ad* 1, 5.

For Wn's untenable combination of $\text{נֶגַעִי} (= \text{נֶגַעִי})$ with Assyr. agāgu and Arab. $\text{حاج} \text{ hajjāj}$, *tyrant* see *Pur.* 42, 21.

From the Greek point of view the Macedonians were northern barbarians, and the Jews regarded the Samaritans as northern barbarians. This explains why H is called both a *Macedonian* and a *Gagean*; it also throws some light on the epithet of John Hyrcanus (cf. W 36, below). This Maccabean prince conquered the Samaritans and destroyed the temple on Mt. Gerizim in 128 B. C. Hyrcanus may mean *Conqueror of the Hyrcanians*, i. e. *Samaritans*; cf. *Scipio Africanus*, &c.* The Samaritans, it may be supposed, were called *Hyrcanians* owing to the admixture of foreign colonists from the North (cf. מִשְׁךְ in ψ 120, 5).† In the Talmud the Samaritans are called *Cutheans* (כּוּתִיִּם) i. e. inhabitants of Cutha, NE of Babylon. H corresponds, in some respects, to Sanballat, Tobiah, and Geshem; see *Pur.* 52, 16.

(2) For the meaning of כֶּרֶע cf. JAOS 22, 73.

* The founder of the dynasty of Reuss, Henry I, was called *Ruzze*, *Reusse*, or *Ruthene* owing to his exploits against the Poles or Western Russians about 1247; cf. Resch, *Über den Ursprung des dynastischen Namens Reuss* (Gera, 1874). The *Gymnasium illustre* at Gera is known as *Rutheneum*. Cf. the title of the Czar: *Selbstherrscher aller Reussen*, French *autocrate de toutes les Russies* (i. e. Great Russia, Little Russia, White Russia, &c.).

† Similarly the Greeks used *Hyperboreans* as a general name for the inhabitants of northern countries, and the Hungarians are often called *Huns*; contrast THCO 162.

(7) V. 7 is a misplaced * later addition (to **בשלושה עשר להודש** in v. 13) introducing a subsequent popular etymology of **פורים**, which is just as fanciful as the Biblical explanations of **בבל**, **נח**, **פסח**, **אשה**, &c or the interpretation of **מנא מנא** in **תקל ופרסין** in Dan. 5, 26–28; see *Pur.* 2, 37; 15, 21; 18, 17; SFG 25, below; BAL 99, n. 1. Also the second passage in E (9, 25) where **פור** is explained to mean *lot* is a subsequent addition.

The emendation of Grotius and Fritzsche, *κληρων* instead of *ὑμῶν* in the apocryphal addition 16, 22, is very doubtful; it is not probable that the characteristic *κληρων* should have been corrupted to *ὑμῶν* (cf. the remarks on the emendations *ὀργης* for *αἰλῆς* in 7, 4; **הנקם** for **נח** in 9, 16; **רכב** for **רכש** in nn. on 8, 10; also AJSL 22, 197, l. 15 and *Nah.* 26, below). *Ἐν ταῖς ἐπωνύμοις ὑμῶν ἑορταῖς* is generally interpreted to mean *among the feasts named after yourselves* (i.e. according to C. J. Ball,† *among your own Persian festivals* or *as if the word Purim were connected with the word Persians*) but *ἐπώνυμοι ἑορταί* may refer to the days on which the *ἄρχων ἐπώνυμος* was appointed (cf. *ἐνιαυτὸς ἐπώνυμος* &c). This institution existed among the Assyrians and Babylonians. The cuneiform term for *eponymy* is *līmu*; see HW 379^b; cf. the Lists of Eponyms in KB 1, 204–214; also AoF 3, 10, 12; KAT³, 331 (l. 9) and 518; OLZ 10, 332; see also Delitzsch, *Mehr Licht* (Leipzig, 1907) p. 9.

According to a tradition recorded by Berûni Purim may be the day on which the offices were assigned (**اليوم الذي يتقلد فيه الاعمال**) and Purim (**البوري**)‡ is said to mean *allotting* (**مساهمة**) or *distribution by lot*; see ZDMG 61, 275. Assy. *karâru ša pûri* (*Pur.* 20, below) seems to mean *to set up the urn* (*καδίσκος*) holding the lots to be drawn for the various offices, and this cuneiform *pûru* (HW 169^b: *bûru*) *urn* (*κάλπυς*) may be connected with Heb. **פָּרוּר**, *pot*, lit. *boiler* (a form **فعلول** of **فأر يغور** and **פארוור**, *glowing hotness* (see *Nah.* 43; cf. the remarks on **قارورة**, **نقير**, **وقيرة**, AJSL 23, 245, 244) also with **פורר**, *wine-press*, originally *vat*; cf. the cut in the translation of *Joshua* (SBOT) p. 68 and my translation of Is. 63, 1–6 in JHUC, No. 163, p. 49^a. According to J. D. Michaelis Nicanor's Day might have been called **פורים**, because the Syrian army was crushed at Adasa as grapes are pressed in a wine-vat; see *Pur.* 51, 38.

* Cf. the last but one paragraph of nn. on 2, 18 and the misplaced glosses in 2, 19, 20, also the gloss **ונח מאיביהם** in 9, 16.

† See the *Variorum Apocrypha*, London (Eyre & Spottiswoode).

‡ The original form of this word is not **פורים**, but **פורי** for **פורדי** = Ved. *pârti*, *portion*; see n. on 9, 26.

For פורה, *wine-vat* cf. also Hag. 2, 15. 16 where we must read:—

מִן־הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה וּמֵעַלָּה	15 וַעֲתָה שִׁמְרֵנָא לְבַבְכֶּם
בְּהִיכָלָא מִיָּהּ הִי'תָם';	מִשְׂרָם שׁוֹם־אָבָן ע'ל־אָבָן
וְהִנֵּה הִתָּה עֲשִׂיהָ	16 בָּא אֶל־עֲרֹמֶת עֲשָׂרִים
מ'פֹּרָה וְהִתָּה עֲשָׂרִים:	בָּא ^β לַחֲשֹׁתָה הַמִּשִּׁים

אל היקב 16 (β)

יהרה 15 (α)

For מִי, *how?* cf. מִי אֵת בָּתִּי (Ruth 3, 16) and Assy. *mí-nu*, *how?* (see n. on מִיָּהּ, 1, 12). For בָּא, in the second couplet, read בָּא (cf. Hag. 1, 9). The omission of הִנֵּה in the second hemistich of v. 16 is due to the omission of הִנֵּה in the last hemistich; contrast לְכַבֹּשׁ (1, 9) where the prefixed ל is emphatic; cf. n. on לְכַבֹּשׁ (7, 8). The omission of the prefixed מ before פֹּרָה is due to haplography; for the *enjambement** in the last line cf. AJSL 23, 240 and the second line of Nah. 2, 11 (Nah. 50).

The plural of פֹּרָה may have been פֹּרִים (Pur. 20, 24; 51, 26) and הפִּיל פֹּר הוּא הַגִּוּרִל in the present verse is rendered in *Æ*: *missa est sors in urnam quae Hebraice dicitur phur*. The translation of הפִּיל פֹּר הוּא הַגִּוּרִל in *Θ* 9, 24, ἕτερο ψήφισμα καὶ κλήρον, means *he cast a ballot, that is a lot*, καὶ in this connection is explicative and corrective (cf. n. on 1, 17). For *Θ*'s translation of הפִּיל פֹּר הוּא הַגִּוּרִל in the present passage see below, n. on הפִּיל.

There is no Persian word for *lot* from which פֹּר = גִּוּרִל could be derived; Pers. بَر, باره, پاره, بهره do not mean *lot* (see Pur. 45, 42) nor could they appear in Heb. as פֹּר. The Iranian word for *lot* is پشک pišk. There may have been a word פֹּר (connected with פִּיר, *pot* and פֹּרָה, *vat*) = Assy. pûru, *urn*; but if פֹּרִים was combined with פֹּר, *urn* it was merely a subsequent popular etymology which may have been suggested to a glossator by the use of מִנֵּה, *part, portion* in the sense of *lot, destiny*† as well as by the oracular practices observed on New Year's eve (Pur. 17, 38; 18, 27; 21, 33; cf. also C 101, 8) and the allotting of offices at the beginning of the year (AoF 3, 10).

Lostage (Days of the Lots) is the Ger. term for days on which it is possible to forecast the future (Pur. 18, 28). At the Chinese New Year's

* Contrast Buddé's *Geschichte der althebr. Literatur* (Leipzig, 1906) p. 26, l. 8.

† According to Glaser (OLZ 9, 320) Heb. בָּר (see Kings 163, n. *) may mean *part, portion, lot, oracle* (cf. Pur. 45, 3). As to אֶפֶר, Glaser thinks, it is not a *loin-cloth* = فوطه fōṭa or مقطب maqṭab (see the translation of the Psalms in SBOT, p. 224, fig. s) but a *band or scarf* like the *stole* worn by Roman Catholic priests, or the *pall* of the Pope, archbishops, &c, and the טלית of the Jews. Cf. the Byzantine ὠμοφόριον.

festival the priest produces a box with small ivory chips variously inscribed. If the lot marked *wisdom* comes out, it means more wisdom for the man for whom the lot is drawn. Similar oracular practices may have prevailed at the celebration of the Persian New Year (Naurôz) in the times of the Maccabees. Cf. the statement of Berûni, quoted in ZDMG 61, 277, on the same day (Naurôz = Purim) the happy lots are distributed among the people of the earth (وَفِيهِ تَقْسَمُ السَّعَادَاتُ) (أهل الأرض). The casting of the lots for the two goats on the Day of Atonement* may be a purified form of some Babyl. oracular practice at the beginning at the second half of the year (*Pur.* 3, 39; 4, 2. 20. 26. 33; 33, 14; 49, 26).

E is a festal legend for Nicanor's Day, just as the Book of Nahum is a festal liturgy for the celebration of that great victory gained by Judas Maccabæus over Nicanor on the 13th of Adar, 161 B.C. (OLZ 10, 64; ZDMG 61, 275). This commemoration of Nicanor's Day was combined with the observation of the Persian New Year's festival (celebrated at the time of the vernal equinox) which is no doubt based on the Babyl. New Year's festival (*Pur.* 3, 3; 4, 39; 11, 27; 19, 10). In the Talmud the cuneiform name of the New Year's Festival, *akitu*, *aqîtu*† appears as אֲקִיטָא (which is an adaptation of אֲקִיטָא) while Naurôz is corrupted to מוֹהֲרֵי (for מוֹהֲרֵי, מוֹהֲרֵי). See ZDMG 61, 276.

The original meaning of פֹּרִים (= Naurôz = *Akîtu*) is not *lots*, but *portions*, Heb. מִנֹּחַ; see n. on 9, 26.

In casting lots in order to determine what day would be most unlucky for the Jews and therefore most auspicious for the general massacre planned by H (*cf.* L, *Purim*, p. 8, l. 13) they did not try every single day of the year until they finally hit on the 13th day of the 12th month. They might have put 12 lots, marked from 1 to 12, into the urn (Assyr. *pûru*) and 30 lots marked from 1 to 30; then it was only necessary to draw two lots. But the phrase מִיּוֹם לְיוֹם וּמִחֹדֶשׁ לְחֹדֶשׁ shows that this simple procedure was not used at that time. They tried first the first day, then the second, and so forth; when the lot decided in favor of the 13th day, they tried to determine the month. In this way it was necessary to cast the lot 25 times before they hit on the 13th day of the 12th month. Cf. my remarks on *Urim* and *Thummim* in JBL 19,

*For the reason why the Day of Atonement was observed during the Babylonian Captivity on the 1st of Tishri, while the New Year was to be celebrated on the 10th of Tishri, see conclusion of n. on 9, 31.

†In the new texts found during the German excavations at *Kal'at Shergât* (Aššur) Assyr. *akîtu* appears as a synonym of *kirêtu* = כִּרְה (2 K 6, 23) and قَرِي qîran (see *Kings* 208, 15; MDOG, No. 33, p. 34; cf. the photograph of the bit *akîti*, *ibid.* p. 30). This shows that the etymology of *akîtu*, given in *Pur.* 31, 3, is correct. *Akîtu* appears in the Talmud as אֲקִיטָא, while קִרְה appears in Assyrian as כִּרְה; cf. VG 122, also the remarks on קִרְה = *kâru* (BL 132) and טַפְסָר = *tupšarru* in *Nah.* 34, and AJSL 23, 246.

73, n. 61 and *Numbers* 57, 41. *Adar* means *λυγαῖος* in Assyrian; the 13th of *Adar* was a *dies ater kar' ἐξοχήν* (*Pur.* 32, 33).

אִפִּיל הַפִּיל is impersonal; so Keil, Schultz, R in K, S; LB *ward das Loos geworfen vor H*; cf. the translation in J, quoted above, *missa est sors*, and the translation of *Leviticus* (SBOT) p. 62, l. 54; see also *Kings* 289, 19 and nn. on וַיַּעַשׂ הַדֶּעַץ (5, 14) and וַיִּכְתֹּב &c (8, 10). It is not necessary to read, with O, הַפִּיל; contrast 6, 9 where O reads וְהַלְבִּישׁ instead of וְהַלְבִּישׁוּ. According to B, הַפִּיל refers to H, and the explanation of פֹּר is not merely הַגּוּרֵל הַפִּיל, as in 9, 24, but הוּא הַפִּיל. הַגּוּרֵל לִפְנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ. אִפִּיל הַמֶּלֶךְ, however, must be connected with הַפִּיל פֹּר (הוּא הַגּוּרֵל) לִפְנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ: — הַפִּיל פֹּר. Even if we read הוּא הַגּוּרֵל instead of לִפְנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ, as Wd suggests, the phrase הוּא הַגּוּרֵל would be very strange. For לִפְנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ see n. on לִפְנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ (2, 23). According to T² the lots were cast by the scribe Shimshai (cf. *Ezra* 4, 8. 17. 23 and C 103). T² also states (*ad* 6, 1) that the King commanded the scribe Shimshai to bring the Book of Records. S has אִפִּיל מִלִּחְתָּא הוּא עֲדָבָא קִדְמָא הַמֶּלֶךְ; אִפִּיל מִלִּחְתָּא קִדְמָא הַמֶּלֶךְ; אִפִּיל מִלִּחְתָּא קִדְמָא הַמֶּלֶךְ (Syr. *ḥ* is apparently a transposition of *ψῆφος*; see *Pur.* 45, 11). For the translation of this clause in G^v and G^a see *Pur.* 16, 1. G^u has καὶ βάλλει κλήρους εἰς τὴν τρισκαυδεκάτην τοῦ μηνὸς Ἀδαρ Νισαν κτλ. Here Νισαν represents a variant (cf. last n. on 1, 4) to Ἀδαρ (it may be derived from אִפִּיל נִסָּן at the beginning of this verse).

After אִפִּיל מִלִּחְתָּא we must, with B, R in K, Wd, following G καὶ ἔβαλεν κλήρους ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας καὶ μῆνα ἐκ μηνὸς (ὥστε ἀπολέσαι τὸ γένος Μαρδοχαίου) καὶ ἔπεισεν ὁ κλήρος εἰς τὴν τεσσαρεσκαυδεκάτην τοῦ μηνὸς ὃς ἔστιν Ἀδαρ, insert לַחֲדָשׁ יוֹם שְׁלֹשָׁה עָשָׂר הַגּוּרֵל עַל שְׁלֹשָׁה עָשָׂר. The Heb. scribe skipped this clause owing to the repetition of the word לַחֲדָשׁ. Keil, Rawlinson, Schultz regard this *plus* of G as an interpolation from v. 13; nor has S inserted it in his translation. The clause ὥστε ἀπολέσαι τὸ γένος Μαρδοχαίου (which I have enclosed in parentheses) seems to be a subsequent addition in G, which we need not insert in the Heb. text. O, however, prefixes הַגּוּרֵל לַאֲבֹד אֶת בֵּית מֶרְדֵּכַי בְּיוֹם אֶחָד עַל יוֹם שְׁלֹשָׁה עָשָׂר לַחֲדָשׁ.

In the same way, the *fourteenth* day, given in G^v, may be a subsequent correction for the *thirteenth* day (so G^u; see above). In 8, 12; 9, 1 G^v has the *thirteenth* just as אִפִּיל. In the apocryphal additions G has the *fourteenth* day in 13, 6; but the *thirteenth* in 16, 20 (*Pur.* 15, 11). Cf. also n. on 9, 17.

(8) For יִשְׁנֵנָּה we must point יִשְׁנֵנָּה; see *Numbers* 57, 36; cf. ZA 14, 347.

For מִפְּזָר וּמִפְּזָר (מִפְּזָר וּמִפְּזָר, S) G has simply διεσπαρμένον, but it would be a mistake to suppose that one of these

participles in **מ** was due to scribal expansion. **ע** repeatedly substitutes one verb for two or three verbs of **מ**; cf. n. on v. 13.

For **עם מכל שנות דחיהם** cf. the *comparatio decurtata* (GK²⁷, § 133, e).

(9) The conjecture (AoF 3, 26) that **לאבדם** is a gloss, and that we should read **לשקול** (as in 4, 7) instead of **אשקול**, is not good; **יפתב ועשרת אלפים כפר כסה לשקול** is not Heb. What Wn has in mind would be:—**יפתב וישקלו היהודיים עשרת אלפים כפר כסה**. But the suggestion that **הכסה** in v. 11 is a gloss is correct; see below and cf. above, ad 2, 18. The interpretation (W 17) that H offers the King 10,000 talents to make up the financial loss involved in the extermination of the people (loss of taxes) is unwarranted; cf. below, ad 7, 4.

Heb. **שקל** to pay, properly to weigh, may be a Babyl. loanword; cf. KAT³, 649. The stem is a Šaphel of **קל**; cf. n. on **ספר** (1, 22). The initial **ש** is therefore a **ש**₃ (SFG 20, 3; ZDMG 34, 861; BAL 100; contrast AG², § 63) = **س**, **س**. For the **ל** in **לכ** and the **ת** in **תל** cf. **فأثور** = Assyr. paššûru = Sum. banšur (BA 1, 161) and **أثور**, Assyr. Aššûr; **عشتر** = Ištar, &c; see my paper on the name *Istar* in JAOS 28, 118, below.

מ **עשי מלאכה** (cf. 9, 3) means here *officials*, especially *revenue officers* (cf. the remarks on **الأعمال**, ZDMG 61, 275). Also in 1 K 11, 28; 2 K 12, 12 (contrast *Kings* 240, 20) as well as in Neh. 13, 10; Ezr. 3, 9 &c **עשה מלאכה** means *business man* (cf. ψ 107, 23) especially *financier, tax-gatherer, collector, &c.* Cf. also 1 S 8, 16; Dan. 8, 27; 1 Chr. 29, 6.

(10) For **צור היהודים** **ע** has **מעיִקא דיהודאי**, **صَحَقَ صَاحِبًا مَدِيَنًا**. The addition **בן המדחא האגני צור היהודים**, which is omitted in **ע**^{VL}, seems to be a scribal expansion; see n. on v. 1.

(11) In **העם נתון לך והעם נתון** the two words **הכסה** and **העם** should exchange places (cf. n. on 1, 6) and **הכסה** should be relegated to the margin (*Pur.* 6, 33) as the question of a reader who was anxious to know what became of the enormous amount of money (10,000 talents, i. e. about \$18,000,000). Cf. for this gloss *Kings* 137, 35; *Isaiah* 19, β; 81, 18; *Eccl.* 20, χ; 21, ε; 25, κκ; BL 3, γ. The King takes it for granted that H will pay the money into the royal treasury; he therefore deems it unnecessary to refer to it, saying simply: **העם נתון לך**. It is extremely unlikely that an Oriental monarch should be so generous as to turn over eighteen million dollars to his prime minister; cf. n. on 2, 18.

(12) For the Pers. loanword **אחשדרפנים**, *satrapas* (**Ε** στρατηγοί, **Σ** **ακστρατιλῆς**, **Α** **ακστρατιλῆς**) see n. on **אחשורש** (1, 1) also n. on **אחשתרנים** (8, 10).

Heb. פָּחָה is a Babyl. loanword. The singular פָּחָה must be pronounced pēxxáh (GK²⁷, § 27, q) not pēxâh (AOG 25). The doubling of the פ, however, is secondary, just as in אֶחָים, *brothers*; אֶחָד, *one*; אַחֵר, *after*, &c. In Assy. paxātu, pixātu (HW 519^b) the guttural is not doubled.

רַב־רִבִּי ט, רַב־חַן חֲמֵן, refers to the *native chiefs*; עֲמָא וְעֲמָא.

(13) Heb. רָצִים, רִידֵהוּנִין, βιβλιαφόροι means originally *runners*, then especially *foot-soldiers*; see *Kings* 232, 34. Here it is used for *couriers* (ἄγγαροι, cf. Her. 8, 98) who were (according to 8, 10) mounted. εἰς χεῖρας τρεχόντων ἰππέων (var. ἰππων) is a doublet; cf. Ἐλ Αἶσα Νισαν in 3, 7 and n. on 1, 17. In Assyrian, rakbu (= רַכָּב) is used for *envoy*, and allaku xanṭu for *courier* (HW 619^b. 281^b). The stem xamâṭu, *to burn* is identical with the stem xamâṭu, *to hasten*; the original meaning is *to flash*; cf. ZDMG 61, 297, n. 115 and modern Arab. رمح = رمح, لمع; also Nah. 41 (purīdu, *courier* = بريد).

לְהַשְׁמִיד לְהָרֵג וּלְאַבֵּד (so, too, 7, 4; 8, 11) is not pleonastic; לְהַשְׁמִיד, *to exterminate* is the general term (cf. v. 6 and 4, 18). This extermination could be effected either by a general massacre (לְהָרֵג) or by forcing the surviving Jews to flee from the country like wild beasts; cf. Arab. توحش = ابد and my remarks on the last line of ψ 1 in AJSL 19, 141, below. See also n. on וּלְאַבֵּד (9, 6) and C 121, below. At the time of the Syrian persecutions under Antiochus Epiphanes and his successors the orthodox Jews were either massacred (1 M 1, 57. 63; 2, 38; cf. *Pur.* 35, 6 and n. on לְאַבֵּד, 4, 7) or forced to flee (1 M 2, 28. 29. 43; cf. *Pur.* 34, 39). ἔ has simply ἀφανίσαι for לְהַשְׁמִיד וּלְאַבֵּד, just as מְרַדְּכִי לֹא כִרַע וּלֹא יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה (v. 2) is rendered ὁ δὲ Μαρδοχαῖος οὐ προσεκύνει αὐτῷ, or as we find for מְפָאֵר וּמְפָאֵר (v. 8) simply δεισπαρμένον. For the accumulation of synonyms, which is by no means indicative of a late date, cf. ZDMG 61, 295, n. 97.

Heb. שָׁלַל, *to plunder* (cf. 8, 11) is a Babyl. loanword. The noun שָׁלַל (נַחֲשָׁתָה; cf. AJSL 3, 107) means here *household effects, personal property*, just as Ger. *Plunder* means *household effects, trumpery, baggage*, while the verb *plündern* means *to pillage*. In certain parts of the United States the term *plunder* does not mean *pillage, spoil, booty*, but *household or personal effects, baggage, luggage*. Ger. *plündern* is a privative denominative like our *to skin* &c (AJSL 22, 251; Nah. 32). Assy. šalālu (HW 662^b) means *to carry off*; so שָׁלַל denotes *movables*; French *meubles*; cf. the Ger. privative denominative *vermöbeln*. See also *Pur.* 34, 18.

* ש has שָׁלַל also for סָרִיסִי in 6, 14.

or רִיצָע (cf. v. 3). If we see *e.g.* that § renders כִּי אֵין לְבוּא אֵל כִּי אֵין לְבוּא שֶׁן, at the end of the following verse, סֶכֶם הָסֵן, נִשְׁכַּח וְאֵין לְבוּא שֶׁן סֶכֶם הָסֵן, we cannot attach much importance to the insertion of פֶּסֶל. The verb לָבַשׁ, to put on is not used only of dresses; לָבַשׁ אֶפֶר is just as possible as לָבַשׁ בְּשָׂרִי (Job 7, 5) or יִלְבְּשׁוּ בִשְׁת וּכְלִמָּה (ψ 35, 26). Cf. also 2 S 13, 19: וַתִּקַּח חֲמֹר אֶפֶר עַל רֹאשָׁהּ. For the symbolical meaning of the rending of garments and the sprinkling of ashes &c see *Pur.* 25.

אֵין לְבוּא אֵל שַׁעַר means to come to the gate, i.e. to approach the gate; to enter the gate would be לְבוּא בְּשַׁעַר, see *AJSL* 21, 134, below; § *aulam regis intrare* is inaccurate.

(3) The clause שֶׁן וְאֶפֶר יָצַע לָרַבִּים (AV, many lay in sackcloth and ashes) means *Most of them had a sack-cloth (or coarse loin-cloth) and overspread (Ger. aufgeschmierte) ashes (i.e. spread over the body).* Heb. לָרַבִּים would mean *Many had* (שֶׁן וְקִיטְמָא הוּוּה) but (וְסִקְיָא וְקִטְמָא מִשְׁכַּבָּא לְסִגְיָאִין) ² but לָרַבִּים means *Most of them had*; cf. πολλοί and οἱ πολλοί (GK²⁷, § 133, g). C's rendering (even) *the great ones* is impossible. The אֲבֵל גְּדוֹל וְצוֹם were universal among the Jews, and most of them even put on the loin-cloth and sprinkled ashes on their head. Instead of יָצַע we must point יָצַע (as participial attribute to אֶפֶר) = מִיָּצַע (GK²⁷, § 53, s). For אֵין יָצַע instead of יָצַע cf. conclusion of n. on 1, 5. The ל in לָרַבִּים is not the ל discussed GK²⁷, § 121, f (cf. n. on 5, 12) but the ל explained in WdG 2, 149, D; nor is יָצַע verbal predicate to both שֶׁן and אֶפֶר, but attribute to אֶפֶר. B and Wd (following § *sacco et cinere multis pro strato utentibus*) think that they spread a garment of hair-cloth, sprinkled with ashes, on the ground and sat down on this garment; so too, S: *Sack und Asche hatte die Menge (der Juden) untergebreitet*; cf. § σάκκον καὶ σποδὸν ἐστρωσαν ἑαυτοῖς. But this spreading of the sack-cloth on the ground would be at variance with the disregard for personal comfort, which is characteristic of mourning. The sack-cloth was not spread on the ground, but put on as a loin-cloth, and the ashes were not sprinkled on the loin-cloth, but over the body. § has for שֶׁן וְאֶפֶר יָצַע in v. 1: καὶ περιεβάλετο σάκκον καὶ σποδωθεὶς ἐξῆλθεν; cf. also §^{VL} 14, 2: σποδοῦ καὶ κοπριῶν (§^L κόπρου) ἐπλησεν τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτῆς. The mourners originally tore off their garments and put on a loin-cloth. This explains why persons in mourning were not allowed to approach the King's Gate. Afterwards they simply tore

*Heb. בכי = *silent weeping*, מספד = *loud wailing*; מספד is more demonstrative than בכי or צום; and אֶפֶר שֶׁן וְאֶפֶר more demonstrative than מספד.

their garments at the breast for a hand's breadth and put on the loin-cloth under their ordinary garments (*Kings* 210, 7).

(4) The K^{ethiv} תְּבוּאָנָה (Q^{ere} תְּבוּאָנָה) is based on the analogy of the verbs לָה and לָא; cf. תִּמְצָאָה, תִּגְלִינָה, and סְבוּתָ which is based on the analogy of the verbs לָץ (see n. in the paper on the name *Istar* in JAOS 28, 113).

וַתַּחֲלַחֵל הַמַּלְכָּה בְּיָדָהּ (AV *then was the queen exceedingly grieved*) means *the Queen was very much shocked*. The use of הַמַּלְכָּה instead of אֶסְתֵּר is intentional, just as the omission of הַמַּלְכָּה in 1, 19 is designed. M was stripped of all clothing save the coarse loin-cloth.* This was distasteful to the Queen (cf. 2 S 6, 20). She therefore tried to induce M to put on the garments she sent him. ט^v has ἐταράχθη for וַתַּחֲלַחֵל; in 7, 6 ט^{VL} ἐταράχθη is used for נִבְעָה, and at the end of c. 3 ט^v has ἐταράσσεται for נִבְּוֹכָה. 3 renders *consternata est*. The stem הַתַּחֲלַחֵל is derived from חוּל, just as הַשְׁתַּקְשֵׁק (for הַתַּשְׁקֵשֶׁק) is derived from שוּק; see *Nah.* 41.

The verb קָבַל (§ 𐤒 𐤓, 𐤕 קביל) is Aramaic; cf. the glosses in 9, 23, 27 and n. on וָאֵלַי (7, 4). Assy. qablu, *midst* (BL 97) = Arab. qalb, *heart* (AJSL 1, 227); cf. last n. on 7, 9.

(5) For הִתְחַדַּךְ (§ 𐤇 𐤕 with 𐤕 misread 𐤕) has Ἀχαθαῖος. This is a transposition of Ἀθαχαῖος, the ρ emphasizing the guttural (velar) character of the ḥ; see BA 1, 257, l. 18. For ὁ Ἀχαθαῖος (v. 9) cf. n. on ὁ Μουχαῖος (1, 14) and for the transposition cf. the remarks on Αγαθας = Γαβουθας = Βουγαθας in nn. on 1, 10. Ἀχαθαῖος may be influenced by Greek names like Ἀχάρης, Ἀχράδης, &c.

וַתִּשְׁמַר הַעֲבִידָהּ is causative (3 *quem rex ministrum ei dederat*, AV *whom he had appointed to attend † upon her*) just as הִקְרַב in 2, 14; it could also be intransitive (§ 𐤒 𐤓 𐤕). Cf. AJSL 22, 204, l. 5; *Psalms* 83, 50.

For עַל read אֵל, as in v. 10 (§ 𐤀 𐤋). Cf. עַל גִּנְדִּי (v. 7) for אֵל גִּנְדִּי and nn. on 1, 17. The phrase צִוָּה עַל, which means *to enjoin upon*, is correct in vv. 8, 17 and in 2, 10; אֵל צִוָּה means *to order to, to order to go to*. This is a *constructio prægnans* (GK²⁷, § 119, ee) like אֵל . . . קָם גִּנְתָּ הַבֵּיתָ (7, 7).

(7) The translation (AoF 3, 26) *M told him everything, and the amount of money which H had commanded to pay to the Jews† in order to annihilate them; he gave him also the tenor of the edict which he had issued in Susa in order to exterminate them, is impossible.*

* Cf. the fifth footnote to nn. on 3, 7.

† Cf. n. on וַתַּעֲמִד (5, 1).

‡ German(?) *welchen H befohlen hatte zu bezahlen den Juden sie zu vernichten*. Wn means, I suppose, *welchen H den Juden zu bezahlen befohlen hatte*, i. e. *which H had commanded the Jews to pay*.

Heb. ביהודיים לשקול cannot mean *to pay to the Jews*;^{*} ב is the ב pretii (see *Kings* 224, 5) 𐤁 *pro Judæorum nece*. In his nn. S explains the ב as ב pretii (so, too, Wd; cf. n. on 7, 4) stating that ביהודיים means properly *als Preis für die Juden*, but in his translation he renders *in Betreff der Juden*. There are several discrepancies between the translation and the nn. in S's commentary, which would, perhaps, have been eliminated, if S had been able to revise his work; cf. nn. on 1, 20; 5, 1. 8; 6, 6; 7, 8; 8, 11; 9, 2. 16. 26; also S's transliteration Mordehai (as though it were מרדכי) and *Pur*. 29, 26.

For the K^{thiv} ביהודיים the Q^{rê} substitutes the contracted form ביהודים; cf. 8, 1. 7. 13; 9, 15. 18.

𐤁𐤏𐤁𐤍 means here *to ruin them*; this includes killing and proscription, banishment, expulsion with confiscation of property (cf. n. on 3, 13).

(8) The Athnah לה ולהגיד is correct; להגיד לה must not be connected with the following ולצוות עליה (against B). The inf. ולהגיד is coordinated to the preceding להראות: Hatach is to show E the document and to tell her about it, explain it to her (AV *to show it unto E and declare it unto her*). Hatach told the Queen the substance of the edict, although he presented a copy of the decree. Even if E could read the copy, she was probably satisfied with the verbal report. An official who submits a letter to his superior will often give the substance of it, so that the letter is not read, although it is produced. The clause ולצוות עליה represents the final request: M requests Hatach to urge E, in view of all the evidence submitted, to go to the King. The eunuch Hatach may have been a Jew; cf. C 145 and the second footnote to n. on 2, 10.

(11) For the etymology of פנימית cf. AJSL 22, 258, below.

For אהת דתו, *there is but one decree for him*, cf. Dan. 2, 9: חדא דהא דתכו. The suffix in דתו represents the *genitivus objectivus* (so S): *his decree = the decree against him*; contrast n. on 1, 17. The loanword דת is feminine; cf. 3, 8. 15 (דתיהם שנות) and SG², p. 57, below.

The ל in להמית (𐤋 למהית) may be the *Lamed inscriptionis*, as in Is. 8, 1 (GK²⁷, § 119, u). This is a variety of the emphatic ל (cf. n. on לכבוש, 7, 8) just as Assy. mā before the *oratio directa* is a variety of the emphatic ma (see *Proverbs* 68, 7). 𐤋 renders אהת דתו להמית freely: οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτῷ σωτηρία, 𐤁 *absque ulla cunctatione statim interficiatur*; LB *der soll stracks Gebot sterben*.

Baer reads שַׁבְּיִט, with *Raphéh*; but שרביט = Assy. šabbiṭu, so the *r* is merely resolution of the doubling (VG, § 90) as in Assy.

^{*} Nor can ביהודים . . . אמר לשקול mean *he commanded the Jews to pay*.

kursû (cf. Aram. כורסא, Arab. كرسى) = kussû (Heb. כסא) throne (Sumer. guza) or דִּמְשֻׁק = דִּמְשֻׁק (Assyr. Dimašqu). Consequently the ב should have a *Dagesh lene*; the *Raphéh* may be disregarded, just as in לָהּ for לֶה (Ruth 2, 14). For Masoretic endorsements of manifest textual errors see *Kings* 288, 19; 298, 12. Cf. also אֲבֹרֶךְ (8, 6) instead of אֲבֹרֶךְ.

AV *these thirty days* = זֶה שְׁלֹשִׁים יָמִים (note Gen. 31, 38: AV *this twenty years* = זֶה עֶשְׂרִים שָׁנָה) is a Hebraism. It means lit. *This is thirty days*, i. e. *for the past thirty days*; cf. French *il y a* and GB¹⁴, 174^b, b; BDB 261^b, i.

(12) For וַיִּגְדֹּר read וַיִּגְדֹּר (*scil.* Hatach) following Buhlin Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*, or וַיִּגְדֹּר (GK²⁷, § 121, a).

(13) For this third message of M to his foster-daughter in the royal harem cf. Otañes' third message to his daughter Phædymia (Herod. 3, 69: *τρίτην δὲ ἀγγελίην ἐσπέμπει*). See *Pur.* 8, 34; cf. also C 64. 145. 149 and n. on 2, 12.

בֵּית הַמֶּלֶךְ is haplography for בֵּית הַמֶּלֶךְ (see nn. on 1, 9). It cannot be appositive to תְּדַמִּי, *als dem Könighause angehörig* (S).

For מִן, *alone of, singled out* in מִכָּל הַיְּהוּדִים cf. Ruth 1, 5: וַתֵּשָׂא הָאִשָּׁה בְּשָׁנִי יְלִידָהּ.

(14) מִן כִּי does not mean *vielmehr* (S) but *for*; כִּי must be connected, not with the following conditional (or concessive) clause introduced by אִם, but with תֵּאבְדוּ אֲבִיךָ תֵּאבְדוּ. The author might have said:—כִּי (אִם הִחֲרַשׁ תַּחֲרִישִׁי בְּעַת הַזֹּאת) אֵת וּבֵית אֲבִיךָ; but the received text is no doubt original.

For רָחָא read רָחָא; also לְרָחָא הַיּוֹם (Gen. 3, 8) must be pointed לְרָחָא הַיּוֹם; see *Nah.* 33, ad 17^b.

The *scriptio plena* יֵעָמֵד may be due to dittography of the ך; see *Nah.* 19 (ad v. 6) and the remarks on אֲחִישֵׁרֶשׁ for אֲחִישֵׁרֶשׁ (1, 1). מִן יֵעָמֵד means *wird erstehen* (Keil, K) not *wird bestehen* (B). The meaning is not, *the deliverance is established* and certain, but *it will arise*, turn up. רָחָא וְשִׁזְבוּתָא יָקוּם לִיהוּדָאִי מִן אַתְרֵי אֲחֵרִי, ὁ θεὸς ἔσται αὐτοῖς βοηθὸς καὶ σωτηρία, ἢ *per aliam occasionem liberabuntur Judæi*.

מִן אֲחֵרִי does not refer to *help from abroad* (1 M 8, 17; 12, 1) as S supposes. Even in the 20th century it is hardly possible for the Jews in Russia to get any help from abroad, e. g. the United States or England. *From another place or from some other quarter* is a veiled allusion to God. The avoidance of the name of God is certainly not

but humiliation before JHVH in order to secure His help; cf. 2 S 12, 22; 1 K 21, 27; Jon. 3, 5. Post-Biblical חֲעִינִית, *humbling*, means *fast*; cf. עֲנָה נִפְשׁוֹ and nn. on the translation of Leviticus (SBOT) p. 82, l. 40. אֵל has for צוּמֵר עָלַי (so, too, אֵל) *orate pro me*, and אֵל adds to וְצוּמֵר עָלַי.

It is not necessary to suppose that the verb אָבַד in the phrase כָּאֲשֶׁר אֲבָדְתִּי אֲבָדְתִּי (cf. Gen. 43, 14 and GK²⁷, § 106, n) means *to be banished* (see n. on אָבַד, 3, 13). E risks her life, just as Sheherazade and the Herodotean prototype of both, Φαυδύμνη (*Pur.* 8, 38). אֵל *tradens-que me morti et periculo*.

(17) אֵל דִּיעֲבַר does not mean *he transgressed* the Law by ordering a fast for the 13th and 14th of Nisan (so J. D. Michaelis) but *he went over* (so C 162) to the City to call the Jews of Susa together and to urge them to fast for three days in order to crave JHVH's blessing on E and her hazardous undertaking in behalf of her brethren. The City, in which M's brethren lived, was separated from the Acropolis (cf. n. on 1, 2) by the Choaspes, Assy. Uknû (JHUC, No. 114, p. 111^b; cf. JAOS 18, 145, n. 1).

ה

(1) It is perhaps not necessary to insert (with B, R, Wd) לְבוּשׁ before מַלְכוּת (AV, put on *her* royal *apparel*) as in 6, 8; 8, 15. Ὁ περιβάλετο τὴν δόξαν αὐτῆς, but Ὁ π. τὰ ἱμάτια τῆς δόξης, אֵל *induta est regalibus vestimentis*, אֵל לְבוּשׁ מַלְכוּתָא, אֵל לְבוּשׁ מַלְכוּתָא. The abstract מַלְכוּת may mean *regalia*. Milton uses *royalty* for *emblems of royalty* (Assyr. simat šarrûti). LB *zog sich königlich an*; so, too, C 163. S translates: *da zog E das Königs'gewand' an*; but in his nn. he states that לְבוּשׁ מַלְכוּת is abridged for לְבוּשׁ מַלְכוּתָא; cf. nn. on v. 8 and 4, 7.

אֵל דִּיעֲמַד does not mean *she stepped in, entered* (S) or *she stood* (so AV = אֵל *stetit*) but *she waited*; cf. 6, 5; 7, 7 and our *stay* = Lat. *stare*, Arab. أَقَامَ (*Kings* 174, 27; cf. n. on דִּיעֲמַד, 4, 5). To *stay* means to *come to a stand, stop, wait, remain*. Shakespeare says: *a servant that stays upon me*; cf. דִּיעֲמַד לְפָנֶיהָ (4, 5) also עֲמַד in Eccl. 1, 4; Ex. 9, 28 (עֲמַד לְפָנֶיהָ וְלֹא אַתְּחֶם אֶתְכֶם) and Josh. 3, 16 (יַעֲמִדוּ הַמַּיִם; cf. Ger. *stauen*).

אֵל נֹכַח פֶּתַח הַבַּיִת does not refer to E (as S states) but to the royal throne; נֹכַח בֵּית הַמֶּלֶךְ refers to E, but not פֶּתַח הַבַּיִת. The throne was opposite the entrance, so that the King, seated on his throne, could see who was waiting in the forecourt.

(2) אֵל עֲמַדָּה is a circumstantial accusative; see *Kings* 136, 37; 298, 3; and below, vv. 9, 14: שְׂמִיחָה; v. 13: יוֹשֵׁב; 6, 12: חֲפָרִי רֹאשׁ. אֵל הִנֵּה שְׂמַעְתִּי אֶת אֲבִיךָ מִדְּבַר אֵל עָשׂוֹ אַחִיךָ; Cf. also Gen. 27, 6:

Is. 6, 1: וְאִרְאָה אֶת אֲדֹנָי יֹשֵׁב עַל כִּסֵּא רִם וְנִשְׁאָא; Is. 6, 8: וְאִשְׁמַע אֶת קוֹל אֲדֹנָי אֹמֵר.

The rendering of וְתִבְעַע in 3 *osculata est* is unwarranted; 5 אִשְׁמַע, אֶחֱדָה.

(3) The מִה in בְּקִשְׁתָּךְ וּמִה is indefinite (GK²⁷, § 137, c) = *what(ever) thy request, even* (if it should be) *half the kingdom, it shall be granted to thee*. 11 בְּקִשְׁתָּךְ מִה means, not מִנְחָהּ חֲצִיתָהּ, but מִנְחָהּ חֲצִיתָהּ? חֲצִיתָהּ. The ו in וְיִנְתֶּנָּךְ (5^v καὶ ἔσται σοι) is the *Waw apodosis*; cf. n. on וְכִדִּי (1, 17). S supplies before this ו: — (*was du auch verlangst*). 6^u inserts in the present verse before καὶ ποιήσω σοι: — ἀνάγγελόν μοι; and in v. 6, before ἕως ἡμῖνος τῆς βασιλείας μου: — αἰτήσαι (cf. Mark 6, 22: αἰτήσόν με ὃ ἐὰν θέλῃς, καὶ δώσω σοι). 3 *etiam si dimidiam partem regni petieris, dabitur tibi*; 11 אֶפִּילוּ אִם אַתָּה בֹּעִיָּה לְפִלְגֹת מַלְכוּתִי 12 אֶפִּילוּ אִם אַתָּה בֹּעִיָּה לְפִלְגֹת מַלְכוּתִי disregards the *Waw apodosis*; so, too, LB *auch die Hälfte des Königthums soll dir gegeben werden* and AV *it shall be even given thee to the half of the kingdom*.

(4) 11 לֹא is preferable to 12 לִכְנֹן; contrast לָהֶם (v. 8). For וְהִמָּן see n. on וְנִעְרַתִּי (4, 16).

(5) The view (AoF 3, 36) that 5, 5-8 is merely an erroneous repetition of 7, 1 is gratuitous.

(6) 11 שְׁאֵלְתָּךְ must be read שְׁלִחָתָךְ; see last n. on 2, 15.

(7) The ; at the end of this verse corresponds to our —. There should be a dash, not a colon in K's *Textbibel*; also the Athnaḥ in בְּקִשְׁתִּי (v. 8) is equivalent to a dash. E starts to tell the King what her petition and request is. She begins: *My petition and request* — then she hesitates and decides to wait another day; she therefore invites the King to dine with her a second time when she will answer his question (so, correctly, B and Wd). The idea, that it would be better to wait another day, comes to her while she adds the humble qualification: if the King is kindly disposed toward me, and if it seem proper to the King to grant my petition and to accede to my request.

(8) The last clause of v. 8, וּמִיָּחָד אֶעֱשֶׂה כְּדִבְרֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ, shows that the explanation given above is the correct interpretation of vv. 7. 8. If this last clause were omitted, we might interpret: *My request is* (= all I ask is simply) *that the King dine with me again*. S supplies in his translation after my request: — *besteht darin*, following 3 *petitio mea et preces sunt istae* (just as LB and AV supply *is* at the end of v. 7) but in the nn. he gives the correct explanation; cf. n. on 4, 7.

11 מִיָּחָד (5 مَحْدُ) is generally read mōḥḥār and supposed to be a

contraction of מֵאַחֵר,* the part. Pual of אָחַר; but the initial מ is a remnant of יום, *day*, just as the final ם in שְׁלֹשֹׁם, *the day before yesterday*, lit. *the third day*; cf. the remarks on אָגַל: in nn. on 4, 14. The adverb מִחוּר is shortened from אָחַר יום, יוֹמְאָחֵר or יוֹמְחֵר, for אָחֵר, יום אָחֵר, יום אָחֵר; cf. Heb. יוֹם אַחֲרָיו (Prov. 31, 25; Is. 30, 8). For the long *ā* cf. אָזִי = אָזִי + ו. The original meaning is *posterior day, subsequent day, following day*; contrast Fürst's dictionary (edited by R) 1, 724^a. The form מִחֲרָת (constr. מִחֲרָת) must be a compound of אָחֵר + יום; the fem. form אֲחֲרָת may be a contraction of אֲחֲרִית; cf. אֲחֵרָה, *at last* and אֲחֵרָה, *at first* (SG², § 155) also פֶּרֶת (= פַּרְיָת pārajāt, ZDMG 61, 194, n. 2) Gen. 49, 22; see *Genesis* 111, 35 and GK²⁷, § 80, g.

(9) In קָם וְלֹא קָם וְלֹא the two verbal forms are participles in the accusative (קָם = קָמָא) not perfect forms. It is not necessary to say וְהוּא לֹא קָם וְלֹא זֶע; see *Kings* 136, 38 and cf. n. on עֲמִידָה (v. 2). ᵀ^u καὶ μὴ προσκυνεῖ με, but ᵀ^s מִן מִן מִן מִן (in 4, 4 ᵀ^s has מִן מִן מִן מִן). Nor does וְלֹא זֶע mean *er machte nicht Platz* (S). ᵀ^s sed nec motum quidem de loco sessionis suae; LB noch sich vor ihm bewogte; AV nor moved for him. In ᵀ^s we find the correction: καὶ οὐκ ἐξενέστη οὐδὲ ἐπρόμνησεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.

(10) For זָרֶשׁ (זָרֶשׁ, ᵀ^s Zares) ᵀ^u read Ζωσάρα (Vet. Lat. Zosarra) and ᵀ^a: Ζωσάρα, i. e. זָרֶשׁ; for the ω cf. ᵀ^v Βωπαζη = בְּנִתָּה (1, 10). The form Ζωσάρα is probably influenced by the Greek name Ζωσάριον. Josephus reads Ζωσάρα (with variants). Jensen conjectured that זָרֶשׁ was a corruption of גִּרִּי(רִי)שָׁא, the name of an Elamite goddess; cf. וְשֵׁתִי (1, 9) and for גִּ = רִ: *Ezekiel* 114, 31 and ᵀ^v Αβαράζα = אֲבִנְתָּה, ᵀ^a Ζηβαθαθα = בְּנִתָּה; see nn. on 1, 10. For Babyl. ק = ג see VG § 45, t (cf. *ibid.* b, β). Jensen is now inclined to identify זָרֶשׁ with the Babyl. goddess of wine, Sirešu (see *Genesis* 81, 34; *Pur.* 30, 34; 31, 25) just as he accepts Graetz's (or rather J. D. Michaelis's) combination of פִּוּרִים and פִּוּרָה (see *Pur.* 50, 2; cf. n. on 3, 7) but his former explanation is preferable. According to ᵀ^s, זָרֶשׁ was בְּרִית תַּחְנִי פַחַת עֵבֶר זָרֶשׁ, *for נְהִירָה*; cf. n. on תַּחְנִי (1, 6). Ch thinks (EB 5411) that זָרֶשׁ is a mutilated form of צִרְפַּת; cf. Ch's explanation of וְשֵׁתִי (1, 9).

(11) Hitzig's conjecture רֵב פְּנִי, *die Fülle seines Ansehns* (cf. رِبْ جِبْ) = *his great distinction* (endorsed by B) is just as gratuitous (contrast פְּרִשִׁים for בְּרִשִׁים, Nah. 2, 4) as his emendation כָּל שְׁנֵה = וּמִדְּבַר כָּל שְׁנֵה, *for פְּרִשִׁים* (1, 22). ᵀ^s filiorumque turbam, ᵀ^s רֵב בְּנֵי רֵב = רֵב (cf. 9, 10).

*In BDB 563^b מִחֲרָת is connected with Assyr. maxru, *front*; but *front* means *past*, and *back* = *future*; cf. SFG 15, n. 3.

אֲחַל before גִּדְּלוֹ הַמֶּלֶךְ אשר גדלו המלך is impossible; *all that wherewith he had advanced him* (B: *alles das womit ihn der König gross gemacht*) would require the insertion of בּוֹ after גִּדְּלוֹ; cf. *אשר לבש בו המלך* (see *Kings* 169, 33) 6, 8; also *כימים אשר נחו בהם* in 9, 22. Cases like *אשר קרהו* (4, 7; 6, 13) are quite different; cf. also 10, 2. S's explanation, *all with regard to which the King had advanced him* (LB *Alles wie ihn der König so gross gemacht hatte*; AV *all the things wherein the King had promoted him*) is not natural; cf. the remarks on the common mistranslation of the phrase *אשר . . . שלחו*, *Nah.* 24, below, and n. on *אשר מלאו לבו* (7, 5). We must insert *כל* before *וית מזה די רבי יתיה מלכא וית* 3, 1 and *אשר מלכא ועבדרי* *super omnes principes et servos suos*. In *כל* *אשר מלכא ועבדרי* appears before *עבדרי*, where it is less appropriate.

(12) $\text{קָרָא לָהּ} \text{ (סָ) עָנָהּ} \text{ (וְ) אֵלָּהּ}$; cf. SG², § 279, A) means *invited by her* (so Wd) *not to her* (LB, AV, S) = $\text{אָמַר מְזוּמָּן לְרֹחֵל}$; cf. $\text{בָּרוּכָה אַתְּ לִיהוָה}$ (Ruth 3, 10) and n. on 4, 3.

(13) **אֲשֶׁר עַד** means *as long as* (LB, AV, S, K) not *when-ever* (B). $\text{Ḥ}^{\text{VL}} \delta\tau\alpha\nu$, but $\text{Ḥ} \textit{quamdiu}$. **אֲשֶׁר עַד** is construct state before the relative clause; cf. **מִקּוֹם אֲשֶׁר** (4, 2; 8, 17) and *Kings* 285, 5.

(14) **וַיַּעַשׂ הָעֵץ** does not refer to H, but is impersonal; cf. the remarks on **וַיַּעַשׂ** in nn. on 3, 7 and n. on 6, 9. **Ἐ^v καὶ ἡτομάσθη τὸ ξύλον**, **Ἔ et jussit excelsam parari crucem** (LB *und liess einen Baum zurichten*, AV, *caused the gallows to be made*) are free renderings. It is not necessary to read the passive **וַיַּעַשׂ**. **Ἐ^v** has in 8, 7: **καὶ αὐτὸν ἐκρέμασα ἐπὶ ξύλον** for **וַיַּעַשׂ הָעֵץ**.

7

(1) For שִׁנְתָּא דַמְלכָא (§ נרת שינתא דמלכא), מרדה שנת המלך (Ⓢ has ὁ δὲ Κύριος (Ⓔ δυνατός) ἀπέστησε τὸν ὑπνον ἀπὸ (omission of ἀπό in Ⓔ is a secondary correction) τοῦ βασιλέως, but Ⓜ is no doubt more original). The omission of the name of God in the present passage is not designed, as Wd supposes; contrast n. on ממקום אחר (4, 14). The personification of sleep (AV^m *the King's sleep fled*) is quite natural. *Den König floh der Schlaf* (but not *des Königs Schlaf floh*) is idiomatic German; cf. our phrase *the color fled from her cheeks*. In Gen. 31, 40 LB has for ותדר שנתי מעיני (Ⓕ fugiebatque somnus ab oculis meis, AV *my sleep departed from mine eyes*): und kam kein Schlaf in meine Augen; but in the present passage LB has the prosaic translation konnte der König nicht schlafen; so, too, AV; Ⓓ noctem illam duxit rex insomnem.

Θ^v reads καὶ εἶπεν τῷ διδασκάλῳ αὐτοῦ εἰσφέρειν κτλ, but 𐤄 is more original. Θ τῷ διδασκάλῳ αὐτοῦ (cf. *Pur.* 7, 21) is just as secondary as the clause ὅτι θεὸς ζῶν μετ' αὐτοῦ at the end of v. 13, or καλῶς ἐλάλησας in v. 10, or καλέσατε αὐτὸν instead of יבוא (س, نحدس, ت, يعل, 3 *ingrediatur*) at the end of v. 5.

𐤄 (מילי דיומא ט) דברי הימים is a gloss (so, too, J) derived from 2, 23 and 10, 2; cf. n. on 8, 14 and the remarks on the gloss פוט, *Nah.* 31.

(2) Similarly משמרי הסה is a scribal expansion based on the received text of 2, 21. Cf. the scribal expansions in 2, 3. 8.

(3) In נעשה יקר וגדולה מזה the two nouns are genitives depending on מזה (3 *quid, pro hac fide, honoris ac praemii M consecutus est*). In the same way we find in the cuneiform account of the Deluge, l. 174: ā'u-ma ūṣi napišti, *what soul has escaped?* cf. Arab. *أى رجل* ājiu rājulīn, *what man?* (WdG 2, 220). Consequently we must read the ideograms at the end of ll. 82. 83, and 68 of the Flood tablet as genitives (not accusatives, HW 556*; nor nominatives, KB 6, 234) viz. mīma iṣṣu eḡēnši xurāḡi, i. e. *I loaded her (the ship) with all the silver I had, I loaded her with all the gold I had;* lit. (with) *whatever I had I loaded her of gold;* eḡēnši = aḡēnši from ḡēnu = צִנִּין. Heb. טַעַן (Gen. 45, 17) is an Aramaism; cf. פתרון in Gen. 40 (see *Nah.* 25, 2). The passages in Gen. 40. 45 belong to the Ephraimitic Document. AG², 303 translates eḡēnši: *I filled it;* for the epenthesis of the *ē* in eḡēnši see my *Assyr. E-vowel*, p. 28; cf. AG², 266. 94. In the same way we must read in l. 68 of the Flood tablet: III šar ḡābe nāš sussulša iḡābilū šamni, i. e. *three σάποι of (sesame-) oil (see Pur. 30, 39) carry her stevedores* (lit. *κανηφόροι, basket-bearers;* cf. also Delitzsch, *Mehr Licht*, p. 39).

(4) For לחצר בא read בא אליהצר; the omission of the א is due to haplography; see *Ezra* 30, 27; *Kings* 245, 35; ZDMG 61, 289, 40.

(5) For עמד (קאים, ט, לא) waiting (not standing, AV *stand-eth*) see n. on 5, 1.

(6) For לעשות יקר מזה cf. n. on 1, 15.

𐤄 does not mean *to confer more honor than on me* (B *mehr Ehre als mir*; also Wd *mehr als*, AV *more than to myself*) but *to confer honor except on me* (Θ^{vl} εἰ μὴ ἐμέ, 3 *nullum alium nisi*; LB *wem anders denn mir*, K *ausser*) S translates *ausser mir*, but in his nn. he says, יוחר במני means *mehr als ich*; cf. n. on 4, 7. 𐤄 (יחיר מני, س, ع, ع) means *beyond me, beside me, in addition to me*. Nor does יוחר מן mean *more than* in Ecclesiastes, as Wd states. In Eccl. 2, 15 יחר means *exceedingly, extremely, very*; in 7, 11 it means *exceeding; superior, better*; in 7, 16: *exceeding, over, too*; in 12, 9: *beyond, in addition to*; in 12, 12: *besides* (see *Eccl.*).

(7) The prefixed nominative absolute, at the end of this verse, **איש אשר** **המלך הפץ ביקרו**, does not reflect the *verblendete Überstürzung* of H, as Wd supposes; this construction is by no means abrupt (B) in Semitic; cf. GK²⁷, § 143, c, footnote; WdG 2, 256; SG², § 317; Dillmann, Ethiop. gr.², p. 446 (Eng. translation, p. 505).

(8) For the phrase **אשר לבש בו המלך** (**ט**) **די לבישו ביה ית** (**ט**) **אשר לבש בו המלך**, but **מלכא ביומא די על למלכותא** (5, 11).

The last clause of this verse, **ואשר נתן כתר מלכות בראשו**, is a tertiary scribal expansion, derived (cf. n. on 8, 14) from the secondary addition in 8, 15 (**ועטרת זהב גדולה**) and **אשר** is a quaternary gloss. If we omit **אשר**, the suffix in **בראשו** refers to the man who is to be honored (just as the Maccabean prototype of M, Jonathan, was honored by King Alexander Balas; see 1 M 10, 20. 61; *Pur.* 6, 35; cf. also third n. on 9, 16) but **ואשר נתן כתר מלכות בראשו** can mean only *on whose head* (referring to the horse) *a golden crown has been placed* (so **ט**, B, K, Wd, S). In **ט** **איתיהב כלילא דמלכותא ברישיה** the suffix refers to the horse, the clause being coordinated to the preceding relative clause **די רכב עלוי מלכא** (**ביומא דעל למלכותא**) (רוסא) **די רכב עלוי מלכא** (**ביומא דעל למלכותא**). **ט**, LB, and AV, however, do not refer the suffix to the horse: **ט et (homo debet) accipere regium diadema super caput suum**, LB (*den Mann . . . soll man herbringen*) *dass man die königliche Krone auf sein Haupt setze*, AV *and the crown royal which is set upon his* (scil. the King's) *head* (this would require transposition of **אשר נתן**—**מלכות**: **וכתר מלכות** **אשר נתן בראשו**). **ט** **אשר** was inserted by a reader to whom the **כתר מלכות** on the head of M seemed too gross an exaggeration; cf. n. on the gloss **ימים רבים** (1, 4). If the final clause, **ונתן כתר מלכות בראשו**, were original, we should expect a reference to **כתר מלכות** in v. 10, after **את הלבוש ואת הכוס**; also in v. 11. It is possible that this gloss **ונתן כתר מלכות בראשו** stood originally after **והלבשו ביקרו** **את האיש אשר המלך הפץ ביקרו**. **ט** **נתן** is, of course, perfect Nif'al, not impf. Qal (Maurer) for **נתן** (see *Judges* 57, 42). Nor is it necessary to read **ויתנו** or **וינתן** (B) for **ונתן**, especially if this gloss stood originally after **והלבשו ונ'**. In **ט** this clause is omitted; in **ט** a hand of the 7th cent. has added in the margin (after the clause **רוסא אשר רכב עלוי המלך**) the correction *καὶ δοθήτω διάδημα βασιλείας ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ*.

(9) It is better to read, with O, for **והלבשו** (**ט**) **והלבשו** and **וקראו** (**ט**) **והרכיבו** the singular, **והלבש**, **וקרא**, **והרכיבו** (**ט**) **והרכיבו** should be pointed **והרכיבו**; cf. the singular forms in v. 11 and **ט** **στολισάτω . . . ἀναβιβασάτω . . . κηρυσσέτω** (**ט** **στολισά-**

τωσαν κηρυσσέτωσαν are secondary). The incorrect plural forms והלבוש &c are due to the preceding הפרתמים. The author no doubt believed that M did not merely superintend these functions, but that he performed them himself; cf. especially ט² (260, 23). The statement at the end of c. 5, ויעש העץ (cf. also אשר עשה המן and אשר הכין in 7, 9, 10) is somewhat different.

רחוב העיר (פתאח דקרתא ט) is the *forum of the city* (Keil) not the place before the royal palace (Schultz, B, Wd). M was led on horseback through the City, not through the Acropolis; cf. last n. on c. 3. This forum may have been before the Acropolis which contained the royal palace, but not immediately before the royal palace.

(10) For הושב בשער המלך (3 *qui sedet ante fores palatii*) see n. on 2, 19.

The question raised by J. D. Michaelis, *Had the King forgotten that all the Jews were doomed to destruction?* is easily answered. The King might have honored M, even if all the Jews were to be massacred in a few months; a soldier (or sailor) may be decorated before he is put to death. But the King had probably decided to discard H and his sanguinary policy, as soon as he learned from the official records that M had saved his life, not H. The order to honor M, which he gives to H, is the first instalment of the punishment he intends to mete out to H (cf. n. on 7, 7). Nor is it reasonable to ask, *How did the King know that M was a Jew at the King's Gate?* This was probably stated in the records; if not, the attendants of the King could easily supply this information, just as Harbonah told the King that H had put up a stake for M. If the King asked, *Who is this M?* some one was no doubt present who could answer: *He is a Jew* (who has a stand) *at the King's Gate*. But M may have been a familiar figure in Susa, so that he was known to the King. Cf. nn. on 2, 10, 11; 3, 14.*

(12) Ⲅ^v κατὰ κεφαλῆς for הפרי ראש (ט רשיה ט) Ⲅ^s מתעטק על רשיה ט Ⲅ^s κατὰ κεκαλυμμένος κεφαλῆν. J's conjecture, that the original text was not ראש or רש, but ריה, is destitute of all probability.

(13) The *Dagesh forte conjunctivum* (GK², § 20, k) is due to the enclitic character of לך; cf. the Dagesh in אקומה-נא &c for אקומה-נא (Cant. 73, ad Cant. 3, 2; Proverbs 67, 41) also Arab. لا يا ما qalilúmma; لا يا ما fi-kúlli-mâ 'amin; في كل ما عام la'íamma, *with great difficulty*; فاما الناس ما حاشا قريشا

*I believe, of course, that E is entirely fictitious (see *Pur.* 21, 35). I merely try to defend the author of E against unwarranted criticisms of modern expositors (cf. e.g. nn. on 2, 10; 3, 14; 7, 7; 8, 11, 13; 9, 3) just as my paper on *Jonah's Whale* (cf. *AJSL* 23, 255) in the *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, vol. 46, pp. 151-164 (1907) is not a vindication of the historical character of this Sadducean apologue (about 100 B.C.) but a refutation of some unfounded objections raised by modern students of the Bible.

fa'ammâ 'n-nâsu-mâ* ḥāšâ Quraišan (WdG 2, 224, D; 276, B; 343, B) &c. The *Dagešh orthophonicum* (GK²⁷, § 13, c) in תוכל-לך (cf. 7, 3: אס-מצאתי) is different. For enclitic words in Heb. see *Nah.* 19; cf. VG 70, below; 94, l. 4. Contrast ZAT 3, 17-31.

We need not suppose that H's wife and his friends were familiar with the Scriptural passages concerning the Amalekites (Ex. 17, 16; 1 S 15, 2-7; Gen. 32, 26, &c). A person who lived in Susa might have seen with his own eyes that it was hard to accomplish anything against a Jew. Cf. the parallels between E and the Book of Nehemiah referred to at the end of nn. on 3, 1.

(14) For the *Waw apodosi* in עורם מדברים עמו וסריסי וגו' cf. Job 1, 16. 17. 18 (עור זה מדבר וזה בא) and n. on כרי (1, 17).

7

(2) For the gloss אוק ביומא (Ἐ τῇ δευτέρῃ ἡμέρῃ, Ἐ אוק ביומא) see n. on 2, 14.

(3) The preposition in בשאלתי (so, too, §Ṭ) and בבקשתי is not the ב *essentiæ* (see *Numbers* 57, 46) as Wd supposes; nor have we the ב *essentiæ* in ובקן (4, 16). א בשאלתי means simply *at my request* (so AV) just as בדבר (1, 12) means *at the command*. This is a variety of the ב *instrumenti*; ב in this connection means *through the force of*; cf. our *in* or *by virtue of* and *by order* &c. Ἐ δοθήτω ἡ ψυχὴ τῷ αἰτήματι μου; 3, freely, *dona mihi animam pro qua rogo*.

(4) א בשאלתי (so, too, §) is Aramaic; cf. the last but one paragraph of nn. on 1, 8.

The clause כי אין הצר שוה בנזק המלך means: *It is not worth while to annoy the King on account of the enemy* (so, too, Reuss).—The sense is correctly given by B (431, 13): *der Feind ist nicht werth, dass ich seinetwegen den König verletze oder betrübe*, except that *verletze* or *betrübe* is not the proper word; it should be *belästige*, *behellige* (see below). The literal translation would be: *The enemy is not equivalent to the annoyance of the King*. The ב in בנזק is the ב *pretii*: the enemy is not equivalent *at the cost* of the annoyance of the King; cf. Josh. 6, 26: בבכרו ייסדנה ובצעירו יציב דלתיה, *he shall lay the foundation thereof at the cost of* (AV *in*) *his first-born, and at the cost of* (AV *in*) *his youngest son shall he set up the gates of it*; i. e. *The laying of the foundation shall cost him his first-born, the setting up of*

* Mā in such cases must be connected with the preceding word, not with the following حاشي. Also in حبة حبيثة ما هي ḥāḥiatun xabiṭatun mā hiya, *a very dangerous snake* and similar cases (WdG 2, 276, D) mā emphasizes the preceding word; the original meaning is: *A snake—dangerous indeed she (or he)*. For the emphatic -ma in Assyrian see also Moses Schorr, *Altbabyl. Rechtsurkunden* (Vienna, 1907) p. 60.

4, 15: *κακοποιούσα βασιλείς καὶ χώρας* (so, too, \mathfrak{S}^L 1 Esdr. 4, 15; but Ezra 4, 15: *βασιλεύσι καὶ πόλεσιν ἐνοχλοῦσα*; so, too, \mathfrak{S}^V 1 Esdr. 2, 19) and at the end of v. 22: *εἰς κακοποίησιν βασιλεύσιν*; but \mathfrak{S}^L has here *εἰς τὸ μὴ ἐνοχλεῖσθαι βασιλείς*, and in 1 Esdr. 4, 22: *τοῦ ὀχλείσθαι βασιλείς*, cf. \mathfrak{S}^V 1 Esdr. 2, 24 *εἰς τὸ βασιλείς ἐνοχλῆσαι* (see below).

In the present passage \mathfrak{S}^V renders **כִּי אֵין הָצַר שׁוּהָ בְנוֹק הַמֶּלֶךְ** :—*οὐ γὰρ ἄξιος ὁ διάβολος τῆς αἰλῆς τοῦ βασιλέως*. J restores the Heb. text on the basis of this corrupt translation as follows: **כִּי אֵין הַשֹּׁטֵן שׁוּהָ בַּחֲצַר הַמֶּלֶךְ**. This may be archaic Hebrew, but even Saul would not have understood it without the help of the witch of En-dor (cf. n. on 8, 1). \mathfrak{S}^V αἰλῆς is also supposed to be a corruption of ὄργῆς, but it is difficult to see how ὄργῆς should have been corrupted to αἰλῆς; cf. the remarks on the emendation κλήρων for ὑμῶν in nn. on 3, 7. C 197 thinks that αἰλῆς represents a Grecized form of עוֹלָא, *injustice*. The original reading may have been the abbreviated genitive of ὄχλησις, *trouble, annoyance* (cf. ὄχλον παρέχειν, *to give trouble, &c.*). \mathfrak{S}^L καὶ ἤθελον ἀπαγγεῖλαι ἵνα μὴ λυπήσω τὸν κύριόν μου gives the sense of the passage correctly, but freely. *¶ nunc autem hostis noster est cujus crudelitas redundat in regem* (i. e. whose extreme cruelty will reflect on the King) is a mere guess. LB *so würde der Feind dem Könige doch nicht schaden* is entirely wrong; nor is the rendering in K's *Textbibel* any better: *da aber der König geschädigt werden soll, so verdient der Widersacher nicht geschont zu werden*. In \mathfrak{S} **אָרױם לײַט מײַקאָן** the participle **אָרױם** seems to be a corruption, not of **אָרױם**, as B-R suggest, but of **אָרױם**; \mathfrak{S} has **אָרױם** = שׁוּהָ in 3, 8, but **אָרױם** in 5, 13. **אָרױם לײַט מײַקאָן**. All these various renderings presuppose no different text. **אָרױם לײַט מײַקאָן** seems to be a transposition of **אָרױם לײַט מײַקאָן**; cf. conclusion of n. on **אָרױם לײַט מײַקאָן** (8, 10).

אָרױם לײַט מײַקאָן is correct and means: *for the enemy is not worthy of troubling the King, i. e. the enemy is so contemptible that it is not worth while to trouble the King on his account*. All the emendations proposed are unnecessary. Oettli's conjecture, **כִּי אֵין הָצַלָה שׁוּהָ בְנוֹק הַמֶּלֶךְ**, *salvation (from this destiny) is not worth the damage of the King* (endorsed by Wd) is gratuitous and illogical. Nor can we accept O's emendation **הָצַר שׁוּהָ** for **הָצַר שׁוּהָ** (S: *solches Bedrängniss wäre nicht hinreichend den König zu betrüben*). GB¹⁴, s. v. שׁוּהָ renders: *Der Feind verdient nicht, dass der König verletzt wird*; this should be *dass der König (seinetwegen) behelligt wird*.

The rendering of AV, *although the enemy could not countervail the King's damage*, has recently been defended by W who says (W 18) that

noster pessimus iste est Aman, inserting *noster*; § אֲנִי סַחֲבָהּ חַסָּדָא גְבֵרָא מַעֲרִיקָא וְבַעֲלִי דְבִבְנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ בִּישׁ הַדִּין, ט, הַמֶּלֶךְ הָאֵל הָאֵל סַחֲבָהּ. B's *ein Drangsals übender und feindseliger Mann ist dieser böse H* da is very awkward. The first clause, אִישׁ צָר וְאֹיֵב, represents the answer to the King's question מִי־הוּא זֶה, and the second clause, הַמֶּלֶךְ הָרַע הַזֶּה, answers the question וְאִי־זֶה הוּא (cf. n. on v. 5). The King asks, *Who is it? and where is he?* E replies: *A man, an adversary and an enemy: H, the evil one, there!* In L's edition (but not in Swete) we find the correct punctuation: ἄνθρωπος ἐχθρός· Ἀμαν ὁ πονηρὸς οὗτος. C xx translates: *Ein Widersacher und Feind ist es; H ist dieser Bösewicht*, but C 198 explains: *Jener Übelthäter und Feind ist H, dieser Bösewicht*.

E had invited H to the banquet in order to be able to give the King this answer. If she had accused H in his absence, the grand vizier would have had a better chance to defend himself (cf. C 168). Here he was confronted with the Queen, and he collapsed, not because he had tried to exterminate all the Jews, but because he knew the King was aware of the fact that M, not H, had saved the King's life, and that H's hatred against M and the Jews was chiefly due to his apprehension lest the trick to which he owed his sudden elevation might become known to the King (cf. n. on 3, 4). The situation was all the more desperate after the Queen had told the King that she was a Jewess and the foster-daughter of M who had saved the life of the King.

אֵל נִבְעַת means *he was surprised, taken by surprise, overtaken* (Ger. *übertumpelt*) not *he was afraid* (so AV). Arab. بَغَتْ means *to happen unexpectedly, to come or fall upon a person suddenly and unexpectedly* (بَغْتَةٌ إِذَا فَجَأَ). The noun بَغْتَةٌ denotes a *surprising event, a sudden attack*. ἔραπάθη, which is used in 4, 4 for וַתַּחֲלַחַל; 3 *obstupuit*. § אִשְׁתַּעֲמִים; so, too, in 4, 4 for וַתַּחֲלַחַל. ט, אִשְׁתַּעֲמִים.

(7) For the pregnant construction, וְהַמֶּלֶךְ קָם . . . אֶל גֶּנֶת הַבַּיִת, cf. the last paragraph of nn. on 4, 4. W's conception of this passage is entirely wrong. It is perfectly natural that the King leaves the room and goes to the garden. In the first place, he was very much incensed and did not like to give vent to his anger in the presence of the Queen; many a man who is enraged will get up and leave the room rather than speak out in the presence of his wife. Moreover, the King wanted to have time to think the situation over. H was grand vizier and had no doubt a number of powerful adherents; so he could not be disposed of without due consideration. B states that the King went to the park *um in der freien Luft die erste Hitze des Zorns verrauchen zu lassen und zu überlegen, welche Strafe über H zu verhängen sei*. The King's suspicion had been aroused as soon as he learned from the official records that M, not H, had discovered the conspiracy (cf. n. on 6, 10). The

statement that the King left the room and went to the garden, is not a *grober und geradezu unerklärlicher Compositionsfehler* (W 18; contrast C 181, below). In a dramatic performance (see *Pur.* 38, 31; 12, 1) the audience would wait in breathless expectation for the reappearance of the King. When the King returned, he knew, of course, that H had no idea of assaulting the Queen; his remark, *Is he going to assault the Queen while I am at home?* is a cruel jest (C 200 calls it *tödtende Ironie*). It showed how the King was disposed toward H (C 200 says: *In diesen furchtbar ironischen Worten lag H's Todesurtheil*).

For *נפת הבית* see nn. on 1, 5.

For *עמד*, *remained* (not *stood up*, AV; *ἔ surrexit*; *עמד*) see n. on 5, 1.

For *עליו* read *עליו*; see n. on 1, 17. *ארום אסתקפת עלודי בישתא מלוח מלכא* **על מלכא*.

(8) The pointing *נפל* implies that H threw himself at the feet of E (cf. 8, 3) when the King returned. The translation *had thrown himself* (AV *was fallen*, S *war niedergefallen*, K *war niedergesunken*, *ἔ reperit Aman super lectulum corruisse*) would require the pointing *נָפַל*; for the pluperfect cf. n. on 1, 9. The participle is more dramatic. Also *שב* is participle, not perfect.

After *על המטה* we may supply (but not insert) *להחזיק ברגליה* or *לנשק לרגליה*; cf. *ותחזק ברגליו* (2 K 4, 27) and *ἐκράτησαν αὐτοῦ τοὺς πόδας* (Matt. 28, 9) also *נשקו בר* (ψ 2, 12) *kiss the ground* = Assyr. *qáqqara núššiqû* (AJSL 19, 134; ZDMG 58, 630, n. 36). See e. g. KB 1, 28, 28; 32, 37: *šepê'a iġbatû-ma arimšunûti, they clasped my feet, and I pardoned them*; KB 2, 178, 19: *unaššiq šepê'a rēmu aršišû-ma, he kissed my feet, and I granted him mercy*. If E was recumbent on a dining couch, H had to bow down *על המטה*, if he wanted to clasp, or kiss, the feet of the Queen. A man may kiss the hem of the garment of a lady to show his humble devotion to her; but her husband may misinterpret it. S's rendering *vor dem Diwan* is inaccurate. If H had fallen down before the couch, the King could not have made his cruel jest. Heb. *על* cannot mean *before*; it might mean *close to, hard by*; cf. GB¹⁴ 534^b, 3, c. This *על* is different from *על שלחן* (cf. our phrase *to sit over a meal*) &c (*Kings* 134, 27). If a man sits very close to a lady in a crowded car, he sits almost *upon* her. *ס* has in 8, 3 *על מטה* for *על מטה*. For *על מטה* = *lectulus convivalis* (Talmud. *מִסַּב*) see BL 68.

*Syr. *גמר* is a transposed doublet (cf. *שְׁמֵלָה* = *שְׁמֵלָה*) of *גמל* = *גמל*; see last n. on c. 7; cf. AJSL 23, 245 (*قعر = قعر*) and 247 (*مكر = كرم*) also Arab. *تجرم = تجرم* (تجرم الحول اذا انقضى وتم) *تكمل*. Cf. last n. on 4, 4.

For הגם לכבוש את המלכה עמי בבית see conclusion of first n. on v. 7; גם corresponds to the Ger. *etwa gar* (so, correctly, S) cf. *etiam* (Cic. *Tusc.* 2, 7, 17) and האף Job 40, 8; Gen. 18, 13, 23; Am. 2, 11.

אף is not inf. with the prefixed preposition ל, but impf. with prefixed emphatic ל; see *Proverbs* 52, 11; AJSL 22, 201, l. 18; contrast GK²⁷, § 114, i, note 1; see also my paper on the *scriptio plena* of emphatic la- (לא) in OLZ 10, 305, and the remarks on Hag. 1, 9 in nn. on 3, 7.

W 18 remarks, the King does not say *the Queen*, which would be more correct and more impressive, he says: *soll denn dem Weibe in meinem Hause Gewalt angethan werden?* It is true that S^{VL} have τὴν γυναῖκα, but אף has את המלכה; so, too, TS³. On the other hand, S^V has ἡ βασίλισσα in 1, 19 where the omission of this title in אף is intentional.

אף הדבר refers, of course, to the cruel jest of the King (see conclusion of first n. on v. 7) not to a special command to execute H, as B supposes; the order to put the grand vizier to death is given at the end of v. 9 in the words תלכו עלי.

For הפו (3 *statim operuerunt faciem ejus*) read, with Condamin (*Revue biblique*, 7, 2, 258–261, cited by S) and Perles (*Analekten*, p. 32) חפפו, as in ψ 34, 6, following S^V διατρέπη τῷ προσώπῳ. The omission of the ר is due to haplography; for ר = ר = ר cf. פורחא (9, 8) = פרחא and end of second paragraph of nn. on אהשורוש (1, 1) also n. on ונדר for ונדר in Nah. 33. س كاحمى وجهه لا سجد, but אפרי והתא בהתא. S *da stand H schmachbedeckt* follows T; but in his nn. he says: Owing to the reference to 6, 12, the reading of the received text is preferable: there M (*sic!*) was a הפרי ראש; now H's head is covered. S adds: Cf. for the game of dice, that took place between H and M, 3, 7; 9, 24–26.—If S had been able to carry his own notes through the press, he would probably have suppressed these remarks; cf. n. on 4, 7.

(9) For הרבונה see nn. on 1, 10. According to S^V the eunuch who suggested the impalement of Haman was not הרבונה, but Βουγαθαρ = בגתר who had been impaled according to 2, 23; see n. on 2, 22.

אף גם does not mean *Huc accedit quod* (S). It implies an ellipsis, just as the גם in כי גם כי (Ruth 2, 21) *I might also state that*, or אף in כי אמר (Gen. 3, 1) which corresponds to our *by the way* or *à propos*; cf. also אף לא הביאה in 5, 12. Harbonah thinks H is a בן מות; he ought to be impaled, and we have not only a malefactor worthy of impalement, behold! there is also (גם) the pole which H set up for M.* If we render this גם by *Why*, we have again an ellipsis: *Why, there is the pole* means originally: *Why don't you impale him? There is the stake &c.*

* H's pole is a May-pole; see *Pur.* 11, 23; BL 102.

The meaning of the Septuagintal phrase is that E had been taken into M's house and adopted by him; *oikéōs* means a *member of the family*; instead of *αὐτῇ* we must read *αὐτῷ*. מִן הָאֵלֹהִים and מִן הָאֵלֹהִים follow מִן; מִן is due to a misunderstanding, but it does not seriously affect the sense.

(3) מִן הָאֵלֹהִים וְאֵת מַחְשַׁבְתּוֹ אֲשֶׁר חָשַׁב is a tertiary explanatory gloss to the preceding הָאֵלֹהִים; it is derived from מִן הָאֵלֹהִים וְאֵת מַחְשַׁבְתּוֹ הָרָעָה אֲשֶׁר חָשַׁב in the secondary addition 9, 25; cf. nn. on v. 5. For the prefixed *Waw explicative* see the remarks on וְאֵת מַחְשַׁבְתּוֹ (1, 10) and n. on 1, 17; cf. also n. on 8, 6. For scribal expansions derived from parallel passages see n. on v. 14.

(5) וְכִשְׁרָה הַדְּבָר לִפְנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ וְטוֹבָה אֲנִי בְעֵינָיו. This is corrected in the margin of 5^s. 5^s omit וְטוֹבָה אֲנִי בְעֵינָיו, 5 transposing clauses 2 and 3. The fourth clause, וְטוֹבָה אֲנִי בְעֵינָיו, does not imply that E takes a personal interest in the matter (as S supposes) but it is a coquettish climax, equivalent to our *if you really care for me a little*.

The clause מַחְשַׁבְתּוֹ הָאֵלֹהִים בֵּן הַמִּדְחָא הָאֵלֹהִים (5) is a scribal expansion interrupting the connection between אֵת מַחְשַׁבְתּוֹ and אֲשֶׁר חָשַׁב (which may be impersonal; cf. n. on v. 10). It is derived from the end of v. 3.

(6) The first clause of this verse seems to be a gloss (or *variant*; cf. last n. on 1, 4) to the second; וְאֵת מַחְשַׁבְתּוֹ אֲשֶׁר חָשַׁב means *How could I see* (5^v πῶς γὰρ δύνησθαι ἰδεῖν) not *How could I have seen* (B, Wd) lit. *How shall I be able and (how shall I) see*. For the perf. וְאֵת מַחְשַׁבְתּוֹ after the preceding impf. אֲשֶׁר חָשַׁב see GK²⁷, § 112, p.

The idea (AoF 3, 3, below) that the final בֵּן in אֲבִדֵּן is due to Persian influence is just as fanciful as the explanation of בֵּיתָן; see conclusion of nn. on 1, 5. The constr. of אֲבִדֵּן should be אֲבִדֵּן, not אֲבִדֵּן; similarly the constr. of שְׁלַחֵן should be שְׁלַחֵן, not שְׁלַחֵן; cf. nn. on בֵּיתָן (1, 5) and שְׂרִיבֵן (4, 11).

(7) The clause וְאֵת מַחְשַׁבְתּוֹ אֲשֶׁר חָשַׁב is a gloss, just as וְאֵת מַחְשַׁבְתּוֹ אֲשֶׁר חָשַׁב (9, 25) is not original. The King did not give the order: תִּלְחֹדוּ עֲלָיו (7, 9) because H had planned to exterminate all the Jews in the Persian empire; this plan had been sanctioned by the King. H was impaled because he had deceived the King (cf. second n. on 6, 10). The alleged assault on the Queen was merely a pretext (cf. n. on 7, 7). The gloss וְאֵת מַחְשַׁבְתּוֹ אֲשֶׁר חָשַׁב is derived from 9, 25 just as the scribal expansions in vv. 3 and 5.

(8) וְאֵת מַחְשַׁבְתּוֹ אֲשֶׁר חָשַׁב (so, too, 5) means, of course, *concerning the Jews* (בְּגִין יְהוּדָאִין) not *to the Jews* (B). LB and AV *for the Jews*.

S in Betreff der Juden. Wd says, על היהודים may mean *in Betreff der Juden* or *an die Juden*; he thinks this equivocal phrase is intentional inasmuch as the letters were sent both to the satraps concerning the Jews and to the Jews themselves. But this view is erroneous; cf. third paragraph of nn. on v. 9.

Ⓢ^v has for בשם המלך and בטבעת המלך:—ἐκ τοῦ ὀνόματος μου and τῆ δακτυλίου μου, but Ⓜ is no doubt more original. J, of course, prefers Ⓢ.

Ⓢ omits the first imperative כתבו and the ך before החמיו, and reads בכחב instead of כי כתב (cf. n. on וכדי, 1, 16) so that אין להשיב appears, not as predicate to כתב, but as a relative clause (אין) coordinated to the preceding relative clauses. Schultz misinterpreted אין להשיב in the same way: the new letters sent by M are to be just as irrevocable as the letters sent by H.

Ⓜ נחתום is not possible in a coordinated relative clause (J). Read נחתם as in 3, 12. If נחתום were correct, we might feel tempted to read it נחתום as a pass. part. = Arab. مفعول. I pointed out in BA 1, 180 that مفعول for نفعول was originally a Nif'al form, the initial *m* being due to the analogy of the participles of the other derived conjugations.

(9) V. 9 containing 43 words (192 letters) is the longest verse in the כתובים, longer even than its anti-Jewish pendant in 3, 12.

Ⓜ סין = Babyl. Simānu (stem سمن). For ך = *m* see *Pur.* 23, 19; 32, 24; cf. n. on 1, 9. Simānu, *appointed time, season* has passed into Heb. as זמן with partial assimilation of the initial ס to the sonant nasal (AJSL 22, 202, n. 9) as in זקים, *fetters* for זנקים (Nah. 31, below). In Syriac the *v* = *m* is expressed by ܙܐܢܐ (modern Syriac zōnā). For the *third month*, i. e. *Sivan* (ܣܝܒܐ *Siban*) Ⓢ^v has the *first month*, i. e. *Nisan*. In the margin of Ⓢ^s this has been corrected in accordance with Ⓜ. Ⓢ has סני (which is connected with סני, *boar*; see KAT³, 398, n. 5) for סין, just as Ⓢ uses סני for טבח (2, 16) and סני for את יום המשה עשר (9, 21). Jensen combines סני with the cuneiform name of a star (*Procyon*?) xabaṣirānu (HW² 268^a). The intervocalic *b* became *v* (ZA 19, 235; contrast AG², § 57, a) and this may have been elided; cf. also Heb. אוצר for mōṣar = māṣar = maṣṣar = manṣar (stem נצר) and אסוך (2 K 4, 2) = אסוך, משמורה = ממתחת = מתחת; see *Kings* 241, 24.

For אל היהודים (לוח יהודאין Ⓢ), Ⓢ^v ἐγράφη τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις read, following Ⓢ, על די', as in the preceding verse; cf. nn. on 7, 7 (אליו) for על די' and 1, 17. This על די' must be connected with the preceding

clause **מִדְּרָכֵי מִרְדֵּי**, not with **וַיִּפְתַּח**. On the other hand, the **אֵל** before **אֲחֻשְׁדֶּרְפָּנִים** (see n. on 3, 12) depends, not on **צֹוֹה**, but on **וַיִּפְתַּח**. \mathfrak{S} , correctly, **מִלְכָּא מְלִיכָא עֲלֵיכֶם דְּמִלְכָּא**. The instructions were, of course, sent to the Persian officials, not to the Jews. The **ו** before **אֲחֻשְׁדֶּרְפָּנִים** **אֵל** must be omitted; it was added after **עַל** had been miswritten **אֵל**. The prefixed **ו** is omitted in \mathfrak{S} ; on the other hand \mathfrak{S} has in 9, 2 **מִלְכָּא מְלִיכָא עֲלֵיכֶם** instead of **בְּעֵרִיחָם בְּכָל מִדְּרָכֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ**; cf. also nn. on 9, 10, 29.

The proclamation was to be made known to all the peoples (**גְּלוּי לְכָל**) in the Persian empire; in this way the Jews learned of it, so that they could organize armed resistance to defend their lives and protect their property. M learned what had happened, when H's decree was published in Susa (4, 1) although H had, of course, sent no special message to M. Contrast **וַיִּשְׁלַח סִפְרִים אֵל כָּל הַיְּהוּדִים** in 9, 20.

The gloss **וְאֵל הַיְּהוּדִים נִכְתָּב וּלְשׁוֹנָם**, at the end of the present verse, is due to the misreading **אֵל הַיְּהוּדִים** instead of **עַל הֵי**. The Jews have always adopted the language of the country in which they settled; the Persian Jews understood Persian, just as the Alexandrian Jews spoke Greek; it was not necessary to write to them in Heb. or Aramaic; cf. n. on last clause of c. 1.

(10) The verbal forms **וַיִּחַתּוּ**, **וַיִּשְׁלַח**, **וַיִּכְתֹּב** are impersonal; cf. remarks on **אֲשֶׁר כָּתַב** (v. 5) and **הַפִּיל** (3, 7). \mathfrak{G}^v *ἐγράφη, ἐσφραγίσθη*, and *ἐξαπέστειλαν*; but it is not necessary to read **וַיִּפְתַּח**, although \mathfrak{S} renders **וַיִּשְׁלַח** (with J).

For **רָצִים**, *couriers* see n. on 3, 13.

רָכֵבֵי הָרֶכֶשׁ is an explanatory gloss to the following **בָּסוּסִים**. Another glossator has added the Pers. term **הָאֲחֻשְׁתָּרִינִים**, and **בְּנֵי הָרֶמְכִים** is a tertiary explanation of this antiquarian gloss; cf. v. 14 where **בְּנֵי הָרֶמְכִים** is omitted. \mathfrak{G}^v has for **רָכֵבֵי הָרֶכֶשׁ** simply *διὰ βιβλιαφόρων* (*per veredarios*) and at the beginning of v. 14 \mathfrak{G}^v substitutes for **רָצִים** **רָכֵבֵי הָרֶכֶשׁ** the term *οἱ ἱππεῖς* (*veredarii celeres*) but a corrector has added in \mathfrak{G}^s : *καὶ ἐπιβάται τῶν πορίων οἱ μεγιστᾶνες*. \mathfrak{S} omits the gloss **בָּסוּסִים**, and substitutes for the antiquarian gloss, giving the Pers. name of the royal horses, a Pers. word for the *couriers*:—**סִפְרֵי**. For the Waw *explicative* in **סִפְרֵי** cf. n. on 1, 17. LB *reitende Boten auf jungen Maulthieren*, AV *posts on horseback, and riders on mules, camels and young dromedaries*. According to Ed. Meyer, *Geschichte des Alterthums*, 3, 67 both **אֲחֻשְׁתָּרִינִים** and **הָרֶמְכִים** refer to the couriers, not to their horses; but this is erroneous. J considers **רָצִים בָּסוּסִים** a ridiculous combination; but modern couriers often travel on horseback

(or in automobiles) although *courier* means originally *runner*. We also have now mounted *infantry*.

𐤀𐤌𐤃 means *racers*; this might mean *race-horses* or *swift dromedaries*; but Herod. 5, 14; 8, 98 favor the meaning *race-horse*; see *Kings* 80, 45. Ἐ καὶ τοῖς ἄρμασι = 𐤀𐤌𐤃𐤃 instead of 𐤀𐤌𐤃𐤃 (1 K 5, 8) is not good; no scribe would have corrupted 𐤀𐤌𐤃𐤃 into 𐤀𐤌𐤃; cf. remarks on the emendation κλήρων for ἑμῶν in nn. on 3, 7. Heb. רכוש, *property* means originally *mount = animal for riding*; cf. Assyr. rukûšu (see *Ezra* 57, 38) whereas Syr. ܡܢܢ means originally *property* and then especially *animal for riding*. In Mic. 1, 13 𐤀𐤌𐤃𐤃 𐤀𐤌𐤃𐤃 𐤀𐤌𐤃𐤃 is corrupt; it cannot mean *bind the chariot to the swift beast*; but the meaning of the passage may be: *Abandon the chariot for the racer*, i. e. try to get away as quickly as possible, not in a chariot, but on the back of a swift horse. 𐤀𐤌𐤃𐤃 may be a corruption of 𐤀𐤌𐤃𐤃, although the reading of 𐤀𐤌𐤃 is confirmed by Ἐ ψόφος = 𐤀𐤌𐤃𐤃 = 𐤀𐤌𐤃𐤃 (not = 𐤀𐤌𐤃𐤃, as Marti supposes). 𐤀𐤌𐤃𐤃 𐤀𐤌𐤃𐤃 𐤀𐤌𐤃𐤃; cf. Gen. 46, 29: 𐤀𐤌𐤃𐤃 𐤀𐤌𐤃𐤃 𐤀𐤌𐤃𐤃 = 𐤀𐤌𐤃𐤃 𐤀𐤌𐤃𐤃 𐤀𐤌𐤃𐤃. Heb. רשׁוּ to cast down may mean to cast off; cf. השליך 2 K 7, 15; Eccl. 3, 6, and תִּרְשָׁנָה (Ex. 23, 11).

𐤀𐤌𐤃𐤃 is derived from Old Pers. khšatra, *dominium*; so it means *dominicus*. Instead of 𐤀𐤌𐤃𐤃 𐤀𐤌𐤃𐤃 we must point 𐤀𐤌𐤃𐤃 𐤀𐤌𐤃𐤃 (cf. n. on 3, 12). This was the name of the horses kept for the personal use of the King (cf. 6, 8: 𐤀𐤌𐤃𐤃 𐤀𐤌𐤃𐤃 𐤀𐤌𐤃𐤃). The horses (saddle horses and teams) kept by a landed proprietor for his personal use are often called in Germany *Herrschaftspferde* (i. e. seigneurial or manorial horses) in distinction from the *Wirtschaftspferde*, i. e. the farm-horses, work-horses, &c. B (436, 3) correctly states: *Wir müssen wohl an herrschaftliche Pferde denken, welche in königlichen Gestüten gross gezogen wurden*; cf. the Ger. *Trakehner*. 𐤀𐤌𐤃𐤃 𐤀𐤌𐤃𐤃 (naked) seems to be a corruption of 𐤀𐤌𐤃𐤃, *courier*, and 𐤀𐤌𐤃𐤃 is a transposition (cf. footnote to n. on 7, 7) of 𐤀𐤌𐤃𐤃 = Syr. ܬܒܠܐ = *tabellarius*. Cf. conclusion of seventh n. on 7, 4 (𐤀𐤌𐤃𐤃 = ܐܘܢܝܩܐ) and *Kings* 84, 3; see also last n. on 4, 4.

For 𐤀𐤌𐤃𐤃 𐤀𐤌𐤃𐤃, which would mean *sons of the herdsmen* (cf. Syr. ܐܢܝܩܐ, *herdsman*) we must read 𐤀𐤌𐤃𐤃 𐤀𐤌𐤃𐤃, † *sons of the herds* or *studs*, i. e. *bred in the royal studs* for the special use of the King. In Syriac, ܐܢܝܩܐ means a *herd*, especially of horses; in the Talmud, 𐤀𐤌𐤃𐤃 seems to denote a cross between a jackass and a mare, i. e. a *mule*; instead

†In the same way 𐤀𐤌𐤃𐤃, *horses* must be pointed 𐤀𐤌𐤃𐤃, not 𐤀𐤌𐤃𐤃; the latter form (Syr. ܐܢܝܩܐ) means *horsemen*. The objections raised by Arnold (JBL 24, 45) are not valid. It is true that we use *horse* for *horsemen*.

of רַמְיָהּ it would be better to read רַמְיָהּ (= rāmāk). Nor does Arab. رَمَكَة, rāmaka denote a *blood-horse*, bred in a stud; in fact, it means an *inferior mare*. But such changes of meaning are not uncommon; the word *mare* means in German (*Mähre*) a *mean* or *poor horse*, a *jade*; هَجِين hajīn means in classical Arabic *of low origin*, a *mean* or *poor horse*, but in modern Arabic it is used for *fast dromedary*. The etymological equivalent of *knave* in German, *Knappe*, means *squire of a knight*, while in modern English, *knave* is used for *rogue*. J's objections against the interpretation *sons of the studs* are gratuitous. Cf. Fleischer in Levy's Talmudic dictionary, 4, 487^b. The stem רַמַּךְ may be Semitic; it may be a transposition of כַּרִּים; cf. Arab. كَرِيم karīm, *noble* and our *well-bred*. The primitive meaning is *dug* = *tilled, cultivated, cultured*; see AJSL 23, 247; cf. conclusion of preceding note.

(11) The clause אֲשֶׁר נָתַן הַמֶּלֶךְ לַיהוּדִים means, of course, *that* (AV, incorrectly *wherein*; so, too, C 217) H; S *wodurch*) *the King had given* (permission) *to the Jews* (cf. יָנַתָּן, 9, 13, and *Kings*, 113, 7) *not which he had given to the Jews*, referring to the horses. S's statement that the King presented those horses to the Jews is unwarranted.

אֲסֵבֶה לְהַקְדִּיל does not mean *to assemble*, but *to organize themselves*, to take concerted action. ℣^v interprets this to mean *χρησθαι τοῖς νόμοις αὐτῶν*; cf. 1 M 6, 59: *στήσωμεν αὐτοῖς τοῦ πορεύεσθαι τοῖς νομίμοις αὐτῶν*, 10, 37: *καὶ πορεύεσθωσαν τοῖς νόμοις αὐτῶν*. At any rate, the idea is not that they should assemble on the day of the massacre planned by H, but that they should assemble in advance to organize armed resistance for the 13th of Adar. If they had assembled on that day, they would have been unable to protect their property. Cf. n. on 9, 2.

The phrase לְעַמֵּד עַל נַפְשָׁם (لَعَمَدَةً عَلَى أَنْفُسِهِمْ) means *to defend their lives*, lit. *to stand up for their lives* (see *Pur.* 34, 1). *To make a stand* means *to take a position of defense and resistance*. The heading of c. 8 in AV correctly states: *Ahasuerus granteth to the Jews to defend themselves*. This is much more appropriate than the summary given in LB: *Die Juden haben Erlaubniss sich an ihren Feinden zu rächen*. The idea of the King is not, that the Jews may attack any one who is supposed to be unfriendly disposed toward the Jews; they only receive permission to resist any attack. The repetition of the terms used in the edict of H, לְהַשְׁמִיד וּלְהָרֵג וּלְאַבֵּד, implies that the Jews shall be permitted to resort to retaliatory measures: if any one attempts לְהַשְׁמִיד אֶתָּם, then וּלְהָרֵג וּלְאַבֵּד אֶתָּם. If the Russian Jews had been permitted to organize themselves for self-defense, the majority of the *pogroms* (see *Pur.* 35, 11) would never have happened; cf. n. on 9, 5. It is true that ℣^v has instead of לְעַמֵּד וּלְהָרֵג וּלְאַבֵּד — βοηθῆσαι τε αὐτοῖς καὶ χρησθαι τοῖς ἀντιδίκους αὐτῶν καὶ

τοῖς ἀντικειμένοις αὐτῶν ὡς βούλονται, but this is not the original Heb. text; it seems to be derived from כרצונם כרצונם ויעשו (at the end of 9, 5) which is omitted in \mathfrak{G}^v . Even βοηθήσαι τε αὐτοῖς is not an accurate rendering of לעמד על נפשם. The Heb. phrase corresponds to Ger. *Nothwehr* (i. e. *self-defense*)* while the Greek phrase corresponds to the Ger. *Selbsthülfe*. *Selbsthülfe* (taking the law into one's own hands) may be more aggressive than *self-defense*.

\mathfrak{M} חיל is a gloss; S: (alle) Bewaffnete (des Volks und der Satrapien). Cf. also third n. on 9, 16.

For הצרירים אתם read הצרירים אתם: cf. Num. 10, 9: הצר הצריר אתכם. A participle may take a verbal suffix (cf. עשני &c, GK²⁷, § 116, f) but the substantive צר cannot be construed with את. \mathfrak{S} has for את ית כל הילוח עמא ופילכא (כל חיל עם ומדינה הצרים אתם simply לחלב, يحلب, دميكيون יתהון LB *die sie ängstigten* is misleading; AV, correctly, *that would assault them*).

S's suggestion, that we should supply לתהודים ליהודים after נתן המלך is gratuitous; at any rate this addition would be just as superfluous as the second עשה after והנחה למדינות in 2, 18. It is probably due to his misunderstanding of the clause אשר נתן המלך ליהודים at the beginning of this verse.

S's note, *Die Lesart* (הצרירים אתם instead of הצרירים אתם) *ist zweifelhaft, da man nicht erwarten wird, dass diese Bedränger von Weibern und Kindern werden angegriffen werden*, is due to some uncorrected misunderstanding, just as the remarks referred to in n. on 4, 7. \mathfrak{M} טה ונשים is a scribal expansion derived from 3, 13 (see *Pur.* 34, 5) but S's remark, *von Weibern und Kindern hatte man schwerlich Gefahr für sein Leben zu befürchten* is unwarranted: a heathen woman might assault a Jewish woman, a heathen boy might attack a Jewish boy; some heathen children might kill an old Jew &c.

\mathfrak{M} טה ונשים ושללם לבוז is a gloss derived from 3, 13 (cf. n. on 12, 14). The phrase מנער ועד זקן is omitted by the glossator in the present passage. \mathfrak{G}^v omits מנער ועד זקן even in 3, 13. On the other hand, \mathfrak{G} adds τέκνα in 7, 4. In c. 3 these additions are appropriate, because all the Jews were to be exterminated, and H had promised to pay 10,000 talents into the royal treasury. Therefore all the Jews had to be killed, both young and old, women and children; and their property had to be confiscated, otherwise H would not have been able to pay the 10,000 talents. Here, however, the Jews received permission only to organize themselves and to defend their lives (לעמד על נפשם) by slaying, if necessary, all the people of the provinces who

*In Moses Schulbaum's *Deutsch-Hebr. Wörterbuch* (Lemberg, 1881) עמידה על נפש is given as the Heb. equivalent of *Nothwehr*.

assaulted them (הציריים אתם). They had permission only לִשְׁלַח יָד (9, 2) i. e. to lay hands on those who attempted to do them harm; they were allowed forcibly to resist a forcible attack upon their persons or property. ὁ ἀμύνωνται (16, 20) does not mean *they may be avenged on them* (so AV) but *they may repel them*. Wd's conception that the enemies of the Jews were to be massacred without being able to offer any resistance (*die Feinde der Juden sollen wehrlos von diesen umgebracht werden*) is unwarranted. B-R 360 (l. 13) correctly states, the Jews were granted permission, *alle welche . . . sie bedrängen, zu tödten*. Similarly S says, *Den Juden wird durch ein Decret das Recht gegeben, für den 13. Adar Schutzmassregeln gegen ihre Feinde zu treffen*; but he makes the gratuitous addition *und dieselben mit Weib und Kind auszurotten*. Even the received text speaks only of the slaying of their assailants.

Driver (LOT⁶, 486) says: If all these measures were taken in self-defense, they need no justification; but the terms of the narrative itself make it extremely difficult to think that this was the case. This statement, however, is incorrect, just as the statement that it seems impossible to acquit M of permitting an *unprovoked* massacre. Nor, continues Driver, can the request in 9, 13 be excused. But the gibbeting of H's ten sons and the second massacre in Susa may have been necessary in order to prevent further anti-Jewish outbreaks. The personal safety of the Queen and the Grand Vizier made it necessary in Susa to teach the enemies of the Jews a lesson.

(13) The phrase לְהִנָּקֵם מֵאֹיְבֵיהֶם (§) (לְאַחֲרֵץ מִבְּעֵלֵי דַבְּבִיהוֹן, 12) does not mean to take vengeance (cf. also Pur. 34, 7) but to inflict just punishment (AV to *avenge themselves on their enemies*). The verb נָקַם is used in the Maccabean psalm Nah. 1, 2 of God; see Nah. 53, i; 52, vii (also vi). Cf. אֵל נִקְמָתָא (ψ 94, 1) and Is. 1, 24: וְאִנְקָמָה מֵאֹיְבֵי הוּא אֲנָחֵם מִצָּרֵי (for ה = ק see *Kings* 187, 21). Injuries inflicted by the assailants of the Jews are to be avenged, but there is to be no revengeful spirit, no indulgence in resentful and malicious feelings, no unrestrained revenge. This may be too ideal a picture, but this explanation is no doubt in harmony with the view of the narrator; cf. (9, 10). J's emendation לְהִלָּחֵם אֶת א' instead of לְהִנָּקֵם מֵאֹיְבֵיהֶם is gratuitous.

(14) J thinks that וְהָרוּפִים is a gloss to מִבְּהִלִּים; but it is merely a scribal expansion derived from 3, 13; so, too, the following בְּרִבְרִי (cf. footnote to n. on 2, 3). The combination מִבְּהִלִּים וְהָרוּפִים would be an anticlimax, just as צְהִלָּה וּשְׂמִיחָה at the end of v. 15. If it were original (§ has simply מְשֻׁחָמֵם) we would expect הָרוּפִים וּמִבְּהִלִּים; the passive participle הָרוּפִים means *pushed, urged, driven*, while מִבְּהִלִּים means *eager*: in 3, 13 the couriers carried out the com-

ט

(1) Θ^v has here $\tau\rho\iota\sigma\kappa\alpha\iota\delta\epsilon\kappa\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta$ = בשלושה עשר יום; so, too, in 8, 12; contrast last n. on 3, 7. In Θ^s a corrector has substituted $\tau\epsilon\sigma\sigma\alpha\rho\epsilon\sigma\kappa\alpha\iota\delta\epsilon\kappa\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta$.

For § has simply $\text{ביום אשר שפרו איבי היהודים לשלוח בהם}$, depending (contrast SG^2 , § 249, D) on the preceding $\text{ביום אשר שפרו איבי היהודים}$. Both clauses, $\text{ביום אשר שפרו איבי היהודים}$ and $\text{ביום אשר ישלטו היהודים המה בשנאייהם}$ and לשלוח בהם seem to be scribal expansions.

The pronoun הוא does not refer to יום , as B and Wd state; ונהפוך הוא means *it was changed* (Keil) = § [מהפך חשב] . AV *it was turned to the contrary*.

(2) Ⓐ נקהלך (so, too, 9, 16) is pluperfect; cf. nn. on עשתה (1, 9) and להקהל (8, 11). The apodosis does not begin with נקהלך (AV, K) but with ונהפוך (LB) cf. n. on וכדי (1, 17).

For § has صَحَبَ حَتَمًا . The meaning of the Heb. phrase is undoubtedly *who tried to do them bodily harm &c.*, not *who were unfriendly disposed*; cf. Num. 35, 23 והוא לא אויב לו and 1 S 24, 10 (25, 26).

The clause איש לא עמד לפניהם does not mean *no one stood up against them*. The enemies of the Jews attacked them, but could not prevail against them. There is a difference between איש לא עמד לפניהם and איש לא קם לפניהם , although Wellhausen reads עמד = קם in ψ 55, 19. AV, correctly, *no one could withstand them*; so, too, S (*Niemand konnte vor ihnen bestehen*) but in the introductory remarks prefixed to his nn. on c. 9 he makes the unwarranted statement: *Die Judenfeinde werden am dreizehnten des Monats Adar ausgerottet. Vom Schrecken gelähmt wagen sie keinen Widerstand, sondern lassen sich im ganzen Reiche ruhig hinmetzeln* (cf. n. on 4, 7). The same mistake is found in Ⓐ (*nullusque ausus est resistere*). Cf. n. on ותעמד (5, 1) and Nah. 53, iv: $\text{וזעמו מייעמוד לפניו}$, *who can endure His fury*. Heb. עמד , *to abide* may mean *endure, remain firm*, and קום , *to stand* may have the same meaning (cf. *to stand fire* &c). Nor is it necessary to read בפניהם (Ⓐ באפיהם) as in Josh. 10, 8; 21, 42; 23, 9. Wd's statement, *Es wird nicht gesagt, dass die Heiden angingen; schon die, welche das Unglück der Juden suchten, wurden umgebracht. Jeder also, der im Rufe eines Judenfeindes stand, ward getödtet*, is gratuitous.

The clause at the end of this verse, $\text{כי נפל פחדם על כל העמים}$ is an illogical scribal expansion derived from the end of c. 8; cf. n. on 8, 14; see also passages like Deut. 2, 25; 11, 25; Josh. 2, 9, &c. The reason why no one could withstand them was not, that all the gentiles were

frightened, but that the Jews were fully prepared for the attack and had organized a vigorous resistance and defense.

(3) For עֲשֵׂי מִלְאכָה see n. on 3, 9.

מִשְׁבָּחִים does not mean *extolled* (I *extollebant*, 𐤌𐤌𐤔𐤌, 𐤌𐤌𐤔𐤌^v ἐρίμων, 𐤌𐤌² מִשְׁבָּחִים, LB *erhoben*) but *they supported* (AV *helped*).

Also the clause at the end of v. 3, כִּי נָפַל פַּחַד מִרְדֵּי עֲלֵיהֶם, is a scribal expansion. It is expressed in 𐤌^{VL}, but 𐤌^v omits v. 4. 𐤌 has מִלֵּךְ instead of מִרְדֵּי. The reason why the satraps &c favored the Jews is given in v. 4.

(4) In the same way the clause at the end of v. 4, כִּי הָאִישׁ מִרְדֵּי הָאִישׁ וְגִדּוּל, is due to scribal expansion; הָאִישׁ וְגִדּוּל is inf. absol. (*cf.* n. on הִנְחָה, 2, 18).

(5) מִן הָרִגּוֹ וְאֶפְדֵּי is a scribal expansion, due to הָרִגּוֹ וְאֶפְדֵּי in the following verse (*cf.* n. on 8, 14).

The term כְּרִצּוֹנֵם (𐤌𐤌𐤔𐤌, 𐤌𐤌𐤔𐤌, 𐤌𐤌𐤔𐤌) at the end of v. 5 implies that the authorities did not interfere (*cf.* v. 3). If the authorities had allowed the Jews to organize armed resistance, the numerous massacres in Russia during the past few years would have been nipped in the bud (*cf.* n. on לַעֲמֹד עַל נַפְשָׁם, 8, 11). But, as a rule, the assailants of the Russian Jews were supported by the governors, military commanders, officers of the police, &c (see *Pur.* 35, 21; 43, 15. 22. 32. 38. 44. 46. 48; 44, 2). מִן כְּרִצּוֹנֵם does not mean *to their hearts' content* (French *à cœur joie*; this would be כְּחֵאוֹת לֵבָם or כְּבָלֵם נַפְשָׁם). It implies simply that the Persian Jews had free hands in dealing with their assailants owing to the non-interference on the part of the authorities. Syr. 𐤌𐤌𐤔𐤌 means *in my opinion, in my judgment*. The Persian governors &c received no instructions to suppress all anti-Jewish demonstrations (the royal edict issued by H could not be repealed; *cf.* 8, 8^b) but they did not support the assailants of the Jews, and allowed the Jews to defend themselves. In this way the permission granted by H's edict was not worth more than the pound of flesh which Portia* allowed Shylock to cut from the body of Antonio.

(6) The addition of הַבִּירָה (𐤌𐤌𐤔𐤌) is due to scribal expansion; the fight between the Jews and their assailants did not take place in the Acropolis, but in the City of Susa (*cf.* nn. on 1, 2; 4, 17). In vv. 12-15 we find simply שׁוֹשֵׁן, not שׁוֹשֵׁן הַבִּירָה. The scribes did not know the exact meaning of הַבִּירָה; they regarded it as a kind of *epitheton ornans*; *cf.* Assyr. Uruk supûru (JAOS 22, 8, n. 7). No importance can be attached to 𐤌^v ἐν Σούσοις τῇ πόλει, for 𐤌^v has the same rendering

* *Cf.* the interesting appendix to part iii (Vienna, 1907) of D. H. Müller, *Die Mehri- und Sogotri-Sprache*, pp. 159-165, entitled *Die Wanderung der Portia-Sage*; *cf.* *ibid.* pp. 23-33: *Die Portia von Gischin*, and pp. 73-87: *Die Portia von Zafar*; see also ZDMG 61, 495.

in 1, 2. For the occasional effacement by the scribes of characteristic diversities see *Nah.* 18 (*ad* v. 4) and OLZ 10, 307, below.

The addition of ואבד implies that 500 were dead or missing; *cf.* n. on לוהשמיד להרג ולאבד (3, 13). In the present passage S has simply מלך = והרג, but in v. 12: מלך מלך סלסל. In both passages ואבד seems to be due to scribal expansion, just as והרג ואבד after מפת הרב (v. 5). The glossator, of course, did not intend ואבד as inf. absol. (*cf.* n. on הנהה, 2, 18) but as perfect (for ואבדו). *Cf.* n. on וקבל (v. 27).

(7) The names of the ten sons of H are just as doubtful as the names of the seven eunuchs (1, 10) or the names of the seven (?) councilors (1, 14). ט follows פ; also the names in י are almost identical with those given in פ; in S, and especially in G, the divergences (which are to some extent due to popular adaptation) are greater, as is evident from the following table:

פ	ט	ג	S	י
1 פרשנדחא	Φαρσαν και Νεσταν ^a	Φαρσαν (και τον)	לכפס	Pharsandatha
2 דלפון	Δελφον	ἀδελφόν ^f	לכפד	Delphon
3 אספתא	Φασγα ^b	Φαρνα	לכפד	Esphatha
4 פרתא	Φαραδαθα ^c	Γαγαφαρδαθα ^g	לכפד	Phoratha
5 אדליא	Βαρσα ^d		לכפד	Adalia
6 ארדחא	Σαρβαχα		לכפד	Aridatha
7 פרמשתא	Μαρμασιμα	Μαρμασιμα	לכפד	Phermestha
8 אריסי	Πουφαϊον		לכפד	Arisai
9 ארידי	Αρσαϊον		לכפד	Aridai
10 ייזחא	Ζαβουθαϊον ^e	Ιζαθουθ	לכפד	Jezatha

(a) Corrected in G^S to Φαρσαννεσταν, G^A Φαρσανέσταν.—(b) G^A Φαγα (L Φασα).—(c) G^S Φαραδαθα, G^A Βαρδαθα.—(d) G^A Βαρελ (L Βαρεα).—(e) G^S Ζαβουδεθαν, G^A Ζαβουγαθα.—(f) G^L και τον ἀδελφόν αὐτοῦ is, of course, a corruption of Δελφον.—(g) Γαγα may be due to dittography of γα in the preceding name in G^V, Φασγα; G^L reads Φαρνα, but this may be a corruption of Φασγα.—(h) S^A לכפד.

G^A Φαρσανεστας may be more original than פ; פרשנדחא; the ד in פ may be miswritten for כ. S לכפס is a transposition of לכפד (so S^A) which may be a corruption for לכפד (י transposed, כ miswritten for כ, א miswritten for א; see SG², § 2, C). The form לכפס is no doubt influenced by the Syr. word לכפס, *beauty*; corruptions of names are often not merely graphic but also due to popular etymology and adaptation; *cf.* ZDMG 61, 195, 9; 276, 8. 22. 28. Syr. לכפס means *foolishness*.

depend on בא. Nor is it possible to derive קץ from קוץ, *to loathe* (AoF 3, 396: *taedet me generis humani*). This idea is expressed in vv. 6, 7. Cf. also Am. 8, 2: בא הקץ על עמי.

(13) S omits אם על המלך טוב.

For the justification of E's request to gibbet the ten sons of H see last n. on 8, 11.

(16) נקהלו is pluperfect (as in v. 2) and means *they had organized themselves*; contrast ויקהלו in v. 15. A new קהלה was necessary as soon as the Jews learned that the edict was to be in force for one more day.

B proposes to read נקום instead of נזה (S^v ἀνεπαύσαντο, S 221) and R (in K) proposes to read להנעם (8, 13) or נקום; also GB¹⁴, 44^b states that we must read an inf. of נקם; see, however, AJSL 21, 141, n. 21 and the remarks on the emendation κλήρων for ἑμῶν in nn. on 3, 7. נזה מאיבהם is a misplaced gloss (cf. n. on 3, 7) with Waw explicative (cf. n. on 1, 17) to ויזה in v. 17; it is probably derived from v. 22 (cf. n. on 8, 14).

Instead of 75,000 (so, too, TS³) S has 15,000 (μυρίους πεντακισχιλίους) M is more original; S represents a subsequent mitigation. S's statement that S as well as TS³ have 15,000 instead of 75,000 is incorrect; cf. n. on 4, 7. We need not suppose that 75,000 represents the aggregate number of the enemies of the Jews (the soldiers of Antiochus Epiphanes and his successors) who were slain by the Jews in the Maccabean battles, although this may have been the opinion of the glossator who added the gloss חיל in 8, 11. We read in 1 M 11, 47 that 3,000 Jews, which Jonathan (the Maccabean prototype of Mordecai; see second n. on 6, 8) had sent to Antioch, at the request of King Demetrius II, about the end of b. c. 145, slew 100,000 men there in one day. The whole city was at the mercy of the Jews (κατεκράτησαν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι τῆς πόλεως ὡς ἡβούλοντο, cf. n. on 5, 5). This, it may be supposed, is the historical prototype of the slaughter of the assailants of the Jews in the Persian empire under the reign of Xerxes.

(17) S's rendering, *Am vierzehnten Tage des Monats Adar da fanden sie Ruhe, und den vierzehnten machten sie zu einem Tage des Festmahls und der Freude*, is impossible. K connects ביום שלושה עשר לחדש אדר והרגו בשנאייהם חמשה ושבעים. אדר (at the beginning of v. 17) with. ובבזה לא שלחו את אלה in the preceding verse, the intervening clause את אלה being regarded as a parenthesis. In S^v this clause is transposed: ἀπώλεσαν γὰρ αὐτῶν μυρίους πεντακισχιλίους τῇ τρισκαδεκάτῃ τοῦ Ἀδαρ, καὶ οὐδὲν διήρπασαν. For S^v τρισκαδεκάτῃ (= M) S⁴ has τεσσαρεσκαδεκάτῃ (cf. last n. on 3, 7). The clause ובבזה לא שלחו את אדר, which severs the connection between אלה והרגו בשנאייהם חמשה ושבעים אדר, seems to be a scribal expansion, derived

from the end of v. 10 (*cf.* footnote to n. on 2, 3). The סוֹה פֶסוֹק should be after אָדָר.

(18) V. 18 is omitted in S.

(19) K^{thiv} הַפְּרוּזִים, Q^{re} הַפְּרוּזִים (as though the ך were due to dittography of the ך; *cf.* n. on אַחְשֵׁרִישׁ, 1, 1) owing to the following הַפְּרוּזִים; but Talmudic פְּרוּז means *inhabitant of an unwallled place*, and הַפְּרוּזִים בְּעִירֵי פְּרוּזֹת is merely an explanatory gloss to הַפְּרוּזִים. In pre-Maccabean times Jerusalem was the only fortress; all the other towns were פְּרוּזֹת; *cf.* W 96, below. According to B and S the K^{thiv} is incorrect. J renders freely: *Hi vero Judæi qui in oppidis non muratis ac villis morabantur*. S has מְבָלִי מְבָלִי מְבָלִי מְבָלִי, just as G^v renders οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι οἱ διεσπαρμένοι ἐν πάσῃ χώρᾳ τῇ ἔξω. T יהודאי די הוו בכפרוניה, T² יהודאין פציחאי דיתבין בקירוי פציחאי יהודאי די הוו בכפרוניה. At the end of the verse G adds: οἱ δὲ κατοικοῦντες ἐν ταῖς μητροπόλεσιν καὶ τὴν εἰ καὶ ἰ τοῦ Ἀδαρ εὐφροσύνην ἀγαθὴν ἄγουσιν ἐξαποστέλλοντες μερίδας καὶ τοῖς πλησίον. This addition was originally omitted in G^v.

For מנות (= מְשָׁאָה; see n. on 2, 18) *cf.* מנותיה (2, 9). Meg. 7^a we read that Rabbi Jēhudah sent Rabbi Osha'yah a leg of veal and a pitcher of wine (רבי יהודה נשיאה שדר ליה לרבי אושעיה אטמא) (דעיגלא תלתא וגרבא דהמרא). T renders: משדריין דורון (δῶρον). J *partes epularum et ciborum*.

(20) Wd thinks it not impossible that vv. 20-28 and 29-32, which B considers to be a subsequent addition, were taken from an older source, and that E was composed for the purpose of explaining these two documents, just as some critics believe that the object of the Book of Jonah is to explain the psalm in c. 2; contrast AJSL 23, 256. B (376, below) stated: *Die Einschaltung 9, 20-32 wird aus einem anderen Purim-Buche in unser Purim-Buch hineingestellt sein*. But it is a mistake to suppose that the entire section 9, 20-32 is derived from a different source. The first three verses (20-22) are genuine, also the first part of 26 and vv. 27 and 28^a; but vv. 23-25, the second part of v. 26, v. 28^b, and 29-32 represent secondary additions. They were not taken from an older source, but added by a later glossator (*cf.* *Pur.* 44, 31).

M, the prime minister, had received reports from all the governors of the provinces, stating what had happened on the 13th of Adar, how many assailants of the Jews had been slain, and how the Jews had celebrated the following day. M sent this information to all his coreligionists in the Persian empire, urging them to commemorate this notable event for all time to come.

(21) לָקִים (לְקִימָא) is Aramaic (*cf.* last but one n. on 1, 8). Ruth 4, 7, where we find לָקִים, is a gloss. The phrase עֲלֵיהֶם לָקִים

means to enjoin upon them. § has **וְנִמְצָא חֶסֶד**. § reads also **חֶסֶד מִבְּלָ חֶסֶד** at the beginning of v. 23.

For **עֲשִׂים אֶת יוֹם אַרְבַּעָה עָשָׂר לַחֹדֶשׁ אָדָר וְאֵת יוֹם חֲמִשָּׁה עָשָׂר** § has **חֲמִשָּׁה עָשָׂר מִבְּלָ חֶסֶד**, just as § uses **מִן** for **סוּר** in 8, 9. For **מִן** cf. **יֹם הַכֶּסֶף** (Prov. 7, 20).

(22) The **כ** in **כִּימִים** (**כִּימִיָּא**; cf. n. on **וְכָדִי**, 1, 17) is not the *Kaph similitudinis*, but the *Kaph veritatis* (GK²⁷, § 119, x).

(23) The section vv. 23–25 is a gloss; see n. on v. 20. The immediate sequel of v. 22 is v. 26: — **עַל כֵּן קִרְאוּ לַיָּמִים הָאֵלֶּה פֻּרִים**, *therefore (i. e. on account of the מִשְׁלוּחַ מִנּוֹת אִשׁ אֶל רֵעֵהוּ וּמִתְּנוֹת לַאֲבִיּוֹנִים they called these days Purim (i. e. portions, from פֻּרִי = פֻּרְדִּי = Vedic pūr̥ti, portion).* It was of course unnecessary in this connection to add after **עַל שֵׁם הַפֹּר** the explanation: **הוּא הַמִּנָּה**. The statement **הַפִּיל הַגּוֹרֵל פֹּר** in v. 24 and 3, 7 is quite different: it involves a new etymology of **פֹּר**, and therefore it was necessary to add the explanation.

The Persian term **פֻּרִים** is equivalent to Heb. **מִנּוֹת**, *portions* or *presents of food* (cf. Neh. 8, 10, 12) exchanged at the Purim festival. The singular of **פֻּרִים** was not **פֹּר**, but **פֻּרִי** = **פֻּרְדִּי**, the Middle Iranian form (*purdē) of Vedic pūr̥ti (syn. dakṣiṇa) *portion*, especially the portion given by the offerer to the sacrificer; cf. **מִנָּה** Ex. 29, 26; Lev. 7, 33; 8, 29. The omission of the **ד** (which is preserved in **φουρδῖ**) is due to haplography; cf. n. on **אַחֲשֵׁרֶשׁ** (1, 1). **φρουραι** (i. e. *watches, vigils*) is a popular adaptation of **φουραι** (with A for Δ) = **φουρδῖ**. This popular etymology may have been suggested by the *vigils* (cf. **שְׁמֵרִים**, Ex. 12, 42) or *watch-meetings* which have been held on New Year's eve from times immemorial. The Purim festival is a Jewish adaptation of the Persian spring festival *Naurôz*, and this is derived from the Babylonian New Year's festival (about the time of the vernal equinox) so that **פֻּרִים** = **מִנּוֹת** corresponds to Lat. *strenae*, French *étrennes*. The observance of the Persian New Year's festival was combined with the commemoration of Nicanor's Day; see *Pur.* 3, 6; 4, 41; 9, 26; 10, 39; 14, 40; 17, 7, 23; 46, 24. 29. 32; * 50, 37; 51, 10; 52, 4; ZDMG 61, 275, 17; 277, 1.

For **קָבַל** read, with **שְׁכַל**, **וְקָבַל**; so, too, Oort; cf. the Q^{erê} in v. 27 and *Kings* 127, 46; 269, 6. The verb **קָבַל** is Aramaic (cf. last n. on 4, 7) but it is not a denominative verb derived from **קָבַלָה** (B, W).

The clause **וְהָלֹךְ לַעֲשׂוֹת** refers to the celebrations of the victory over their assailants, and **אֵת אֲשֶׁר כָּתַב מִרְדָּכִי אֱלֹהֵם** alludes to the two days of feasting on the 14th and 15th of Adar. The Jews in Susa had celebrated the 15th day; the provincial Jews, the 14th. M recommended the perpetual general observance of both days.

*In l. 22 read Franz for Harder.

עס־זיה (Neh. 5, 18) and WdG 2, 164, below. The statement of the glossator, ישוב מחשבתי הרעה אשר השב על היהודים על ראשו וחלו, is at variance with the original narrative; the glossator might have said: ישוב מחשבתי הרעה אשר השב על מרדכי; cf. n. on 8, 7.

(26) For the first part of v. 26 see n. on v. 23. The author of the original Book may have known that פֶּרֶךְ (or rather פֶּרִי=פורי) was a Pers. word for מִנָּה. S reads $\text{עֲלֵהֶם מִן־אֵן לְחֶמְדָּה מִן־עֲלֵהֶם חֶמְדָּה}$; here עֲלֵהֶם may be a corruption (or adaptation) of עֵל . Instead of עֲלֵהֶם it would be better to point עֲלֵהֶם . T has $\text{בְּגִין כֵּן קָרוּ לְיוֹמִיָּא}$; $\text{קָרוּ לְיוֹמִתָּא הָאֵילִין פּוֹרִיָּא עַל שׁוֹם}$; פּוֹרִיָּא is derived from פּוֹרִיָּא , *wrath*, i.e. *punishment, trial* (cf. AJSL 23, 227, l. 11; ZDMG 61, 286, 30) from פּוֹר , to boil (see Nah. 43). The rendering *Unheil* (given in Dalman's *Wörterbuch*) is unwarranted. T² may have combined פֶּרִי with פֶּרֶךְ, *winepress*=*Blutbad* (massacre, carnage). See Pur. 51, 38 and third paragraph of nn. on 3, 7.

The second part of v. 26 is a gloss explaining the עַל כֵּן at the beginning of the verse, with special reference to קִימְנוּ at the beginning of v. 27. The עַל כֵּן to be explained is repeated at the beginning of the explanation; see *Ezekiel* 41, 16.22.27 and the translation of Ezek. (SBOT) p. 1, below; p. 94, below; cf. also gloss τ in my restoration of ψ 68 (AJSL 23, 239 and 224)). Two explanations of עַל כֵּן are given; the first is: $\text{עַל כֵּן דְּבַרִּי הָאֲגֵרָה הַזֹּאת וּמָה רָאוּ}$; the second: $\text{עַל כֵּן דְּבַרִּי הָאֲגֵרָה הַזֹּאת וּמָה רָאוּ}$. The phrase $\text{עַל כֵּן דְּבַרִּי הָאֲגֵרָה הַזֹּאת וּמָה רָאוּ}$ was sufficiently explicit; therefore this tertiary gloss substitutes simply $\text{עַל כֵּן דְּבַרִּי הָאֲגֵרָה הַזֹּאת וּמָה רָאוּ}$. The phrase $\text{עַל כֵּן דְּבַרִּי הָאֲגֵרָה הַזֹּאת וּמָה רָאוּ}$ might be misunderstood, and was therefore explained by $\text{עַל כֵּן דְּבַרִּי הָאֲגֵרָה הַזֹּאת וּמָה רָאוּ}$, in order to make it clear that מָה רָאוּ did not mean *what they had seen*, but *what they had experienced*; cf. the explanation of פּוֹרִיָּא in T², quoted above, $\text{וְעַקְתָּא דְּאֵרֵי יִתּוֹן}$. S's rendering, *Deswegen, nach allen den Worten des Briefs, so wohl in Betreff dessen, was sie selbst dieserhalb erlebten, als dessen was sie betraf, setzten die Juden fest*, is monstrous (cf. n. on 4, 7). Also AV and K connect the verb at the beginning of v. 27 with the preceding clause.

(27) For קִימְנוּ read וְקִימְנוּ . This is the sequel of the clause at the beginning of v. 26, $\text{עַל כֵּן קִימְנוּ לְיוֹמִיָּא הָאֵלֹהִים פּוֹרִיָּא עַל שׁוֹם הַפּוֹר}$, the verb קִימְנוּ being coordinated to קִימְנוּ .

The following וְקִימְנוּ (Q^{re}) is a gloss to the preceding קִימְנוּ ; it was added owing to the וְקִימְנוּ at the beginning of the gloss vv. 23–25.

ס has simply סמכד for both קימו וקבל; cf. n. on v. 21, also footnote to n. on 2, 3.

הנללים refers to the *proselytes* (contrast מתידיים in 8, 17).

For עליהם we must not read אליהם (contrast last n. on 4, 5). In הנללים this preposition means *in addition to*; see *Kings* 125, 7.

ולא יעבור (cf. 1, 19) is misplaced; it should be transposed to the end of this verse, after בכל שנה בשנה, and instead of ולא יעבור we must read יעברו האלה, referring to שני הימים האלה; cf. the gloss in v. 28^b. The letters י and ר are easily confounded; cf. n. on חפר (7, 8). For transposition of י see also *Nah.* 41 (ולוהב לרוהב, &c).

ככתבם וכזמנם, according to their writing and according to their time (but סמכד סמכד means according to the written traditions concerning these days (festal regulations, festal legends, &c; see *Pur.* 11, 35; 9, 22) and according to their dates, viz. the 14th and 15th of Adar; i.e. the last full moon of the שנה, the tropical year (*AJSL* 22, 256). For the reason why the two spring festivals, Purim and Passover, are not celebrated at the vernal equinox, on the first day of the first month, but on the 14th and 15th days of the 12th and the 1st months, respectively, see conclusion of n. on v. 31. For the two days of the festival cf. ביום החדש השני (1 S 20, 34). B's view that ככתבם refers to M's letter (vv. 20, 23) is erroneous. For זמן cf. n. on סירן (8, 9).

(28) The second part of this verse is an explanatory gloss, not only to the first part of v. 28, but also to the end of v. 27. ס has נחש for יסוך, and נחש for יסוך.

(29) Verses 29–32 represent a subsequent addition.

בת אביחיל, which seems to be a tertiary addition, see n. on 2, 15.

The prefixed ו in ומרדכי is a secondary addition (cf. n. on v. 10). The original text of this gloss was no doubt: וכתב אסתר המלכה את כל תוקם מרדכי היהודי לקים את אפרת הפרים, *Queen E described all the power of the Jew M in order to enjoin this Purim message* (which M had sent to the Jews; see vv. 20–22) i.e. E sent a letter to all the Jews setting forth M's capacity for action and performance (especially *ἃ α ἐποίησεν*, what he had accomplished for his coreligionists and what he might accomplish for them in the future) and urging them to observe the feast of Purim as prescribed by M. V. 32 (ויאמר אסתר) speaks only of E, not of M. *Σ*^v reads in the present verse: καὶ ἔγραψεν Εσθηρ ἡ βασιλισσα θυγάτηρ Αμναδαβ καὶ Μαρδοχαῖος ὁ Ἰουδαῖος ἃ α ἐποίησαν. The original reading may have been καὶ ἔγραψεν Εσθηρ ἡ βασιλισσα θυγάτηρ Αμναδαβ ἃ α ἐποίησεν (so *Σ*^s) Μαρδοχαῖος ὁ Ἰουδαῖος.

אח כל תוקם אה cannot mean with all strength, with all energy; AV with all authority; K unter Einsetzung ihres ganzen Ansehens;

¶ *omni studio*. This expression would be still more peculiar than the phrase **אמר עם הכפר** (v. 25). *With all energy or most emphatically* might be expressed by **בכל חזקה** or **בכל חזקה**, but not **את כל חזקה**. *I love thee with all my strength* (cf. Mark 12, 30) would be **אהבך בכל** (cf. Deut. 6, 5). The prefixed **את** must be the *nota accusativi*; so **חזקה** (ית כל חזקה). For **את=ית** see Nah. 25. **חזקה** has **חזקה** for **את כל חזקה**.

¶ **השנית** is a tertiary gloss; cf. n. on 2, 14. Also **הזאת** is a subsequent addition.

(30) V. 30 is omitted in G.

¶ **וישלה** (**שלה**) is impersonal (cf. n. on 8, 10). But the original text may have been **והשלה**; the masculine form may have been substituted after **היהודי מרדכי** (v. 29) had been transposed. In Cant. 2, 7, on the other hand, the feminine form has been substituted for the masculine form (**את האהבה** is a later addition) because **עד שיחפץ** may have reminded some readers of Job 40, 17: **יהפץ זנבו כארז**, where **זנב** = *cauda* Hor. Sat. 1, 2, 45; 2, 7, 49. The original meaning of **הפץ** = **שפץ** is *intendere*. Cf. the explanation of the *scriptio plena* **ישינה** (Cant. 5, 2) BL 33.

For **מלכות** read **במלכות**; cf. n. on **בבית** (1, 9) and GK²⁷, § 118, g; **מלכות**.

¶ **דברי שלום ואמת** (**שלום ואמת**, transposed, **שלום ואמת**) does not mean *words of peace and truth* (so AV; S *Worte des Friedens und der Wahrheit*; ¶ *ut haberent pacem et susciperent veritatem*; **מילי** **דשלום ואמת** but *words of greeting and faithfulness* (cf. *Psalms* 80, 27). LB *mit freundlichen und treuen Worten*, K *mit freundschaftlichen und wohlgemeinten Worten*. The Queen, of course, did not send a warlike message or a statement that was not true; but she sent her coreligionists friendly greetings, emphasizing the fact that she would remain a faithful Jewess and never abandon the religion of her fathers.

(31) ¶ **ואסתר המלכה** after **מרדכי היהודי** is a tertiary gloss.

The **עליהם** in **עליהם קים כאשר** does not refer to **עליהם**, as Wd supposes, but to the Jews; cf. **לקים עליהם** in v. 21.

¶ **דברי הצומות וזעקתם**, at the end of this verse, means *the procedures* (cf. n. on 1, 13) or *institutions of the great fast* (plur. intens.) and *their crying* (or *invocation*), **צלותהון**, **צומא** **מילי דצומא** **ודתעניתא**. This refers to 4, 1.3.16. M had *cried with a loud and bitter cry* (**וירזעק זעקה גדלה ומרה**) and the Jews had fasted, wept, and lamented (**צום ובכי ומספד**) when the edict of H became known. Afterwards E asked M to fast with all the Jews of Susa for her sake, three days and three nights, before she went to the King, and E herself with her maids fasted in the same way.

לקיים את ימי הפסח, . . . would seem to imply that the Jews had adopted the fasting (and crying) before they adopted the feasting. They may have observed the Babyl. New Year's festival at first as a fast-day, but the less orthodox Jews (the Sadduceans) may have gradually adopted the celebration of the (Babyl. and) Persian New Year's festival (just as many modern Jews celebrate Christmas). This was afterwards sanctioned by the ecclesiastical authorities, but the date was changed: the feast was celebrated, not at the beginning of the first month, but at the middle of the preceding month, just as the ancient Heb. spring festival, the Passover, was not celebrated at the beginning (new moon) of the first month (about the time of the vernal equinox) but at the middle (full moon) of the first month, in order to avoid a coincidence of the Jewish Passover and the Babylonian New Year's festival.

During the Babyl. Captivity Ezekiel (about 570 B. C.) recommended to observe the Day of Atonement on the 1st of Tishri, while the New Year was to be celebrated on the 10th of Tishri, in order to avoid a coincidence of the Jewish New Year with the Babyl. festival at the beginning of the second half of the year. Under Persian dominion, about 500 B. C. (when the Priestly Code was compiled in Babylonia) the two festivals in the seventh month, as prescribed by Ezekiel, exchanged places so that the Day of Atonement was observed on the 10th of Tishri, because the Persians celebrated the *μαγοφόνια* on that day. Cf. n. on v. 27 and *Pur.* 4, 20-37; 20, 3; 33, 14.

(32) Wd's view that **בספר** refers either to the book from which the author took the two letters (*cf.* n. on v. 20) or to our Book of E, is gratuitous. Heb. **בספר** does not necessarily mean *in the book* (AV) it may also mean *in a book* (so K, S) see *Kings* 191, 37.

(1) For the misplaced gloss in v. 1 see fourth paragraph of nn. on 2, 18.

(2) In v. 2^a we must transpose α and β : the opening clause, **וכל מעשה תקפו וגבורתו**, should follow the second clause, **ופרשת גדלת**; **מירדכי אשר גדלו המלך**; even the first clause **וכל מעשה תקפו וגבורתו** refers to M, not to the King.

The clause **גדלו המלך אשר** is a scribal expansion derived from 5, 11; it cannot mean *whereunto the King advanced him* (so AV; K *zu der ihn der König erhob*) nor does it mean *whom the King advanced* (so S; **אשר מלכא**, **די רבייה מלכא**, **די רבי יתיה מלכא**, **די רבי יתיה מלכא**) or *whereby the King had advanced him* (B; **3** *qua exaltavit Mardochæum*). Cf. footnote to n. on 2, 3.

(3) For וגדול ליהודים it would be better to read ביהודים וגדול. וכן ח' מכלל §. The ל instead of ב seems to be due to the ל in ורעי ארבע לרב אחיו, and to the following clause, משנה למלך, omitted in §) which, of course, does not mean *acceptable to most of his brethren* (contrast n. on 4, 3) but *acceptable to the multitude of his brethren*, i. e. *to his numerous coreligionists* (so B, S). In the large number of his coreligionists there was not one who disliked him. Cf. רב בניו, *the large number of his sons* (5, 11).

The phrase לרש טוב לעמו means: he tried to promote the interests of the Jews, while ודבר שלום לכל זרעו implies that he was not haughty and distant, but affable and kind to the meanest among his brethren, in spite of his exalted position. For דבר שלום S refers to Zech. 9, 10; ψ 85, 9. Cf. ψ 122: אֲדַבְרֶה נָא שְׁלוֹם בְּךָ and אֶבְקֶשָׁה שׁוֹב לְךָ.

[The Hebrew text follows.]

9, 22 עשר בו בכל שנה ושנה: כימים אשר נהו בהם היהודים מאיביהם
והחדש אשר נחפץ להם מייגון לשמחה ומאבל ליום טוב לעשות
אותם ימי משתה ושמחה ומשלח מנות איש לרעהו ומתנות
27, 26 לאבינים: ^פ על כן קראו לימים האלה פורים על שם הפור: ^ו וקיימו
היהודים עליהם ועל זרעם ועל כל הנלוים עליהם {} להיות עשים
את שני הימים האלה ככתבם וכזמנם בכל שנה ושנה {ולא יעברו}:
28 והימים האלה נזכרים ונעשים בכל דור ודור משפחה ומשפחה
מדינה ומדינה ועיר ועיר: ^פ

10, 2 {} ופרשת גדלת מרדכי {וכל מעשה תקפו וגבורתו} הלוא הם
3 כתובים על ספר דברי הימים למלכי מדי ופרס: כי מרדכי
היהודי משנה למלך ^פ וגדול ^ב היהודים ורצוי לרב אחיו דרש טוב
לעמו ודבר שלום לכל זרעו:

9, 23 (ρ) וקבלו היהודים את אשר החלו לעשות ואת אשר כתב מרדכי אליהם:
24 כי המן בן המדתא ה'גא'ני צרר כל היהודים חשב על היהודים לאבדם
כה והפל פור (הוא הגורל) לה'ם ^{ββ}: ובבאה לפני המלך אמר ^γ ישוב
מחשבתו הרעה אשר חשב על היהודים על ראשו ותלו אותו ואת בניו
על העץ:

26 (σ) על כן על כל דברי האגרת הזאת ומה ראו ⁸⁸ 27 (τ) וקבלו
28 (υ) וימי הפורים האלה לא יעברו מתוך היהודים וזכרם לא יסור מזרעם
29 (φ) ותכתב אסתר המלכה {} את כל תקם {} מרדכי היהודי לקים את
ל אגרת הקרים: ^ל וישלח ספרים אל כל היהודים אל שבע ועשרים
31 ומאה מדינה 'ב'מלכות אחש'ר' ^ו דברי שלום ואמת: לקים את
ימי הקרים האלה בזמניהם כאשר קים עליהם מרדכי היהודי ^ו וכאשר
32 קיימו על נפשם ועל זרעם דברי הצומות וזעקתם: ומאמר אסתר
קים דברי הקרים האלה ונכתב בספר:

10, 2 (α) אשר גדלו המלך 3 (β) אחש'ר' ^ו

9, 24 (ββ) ולאבדם 9, 25 (γγ) עם הספר 26 (δδ) על ככה ומה הגיע אליהם
29 (εε) בת אביחיל 31 (ηη) ואסתר המלכה 32 (θθ) הזאת השנית

9, 6 מִפֶּת חֶרֶב יַעֲשׂוּ בִשְׁנֵאֵיהֶם כְּרִצּוֹנָם: וּבִשְׁוֹשָׁן⁹ הִרְגוּ הַיְּהוּדִים
חֲמֵשׁ מֵאוֹת אִישׁ:

7	וְאֵת פֶּרְשֵׁי־חָתָא	וְאֵת אֲרִידָתָא:
	וְאֵת דִּלְפּוֹן	9 וְאֵת פֶּרְמִשְׁתָּא
	וְאֵת אֶסְפָּתָא:	וְאֵת אֲרִיפִי
8	וְאֵת פֶּרְדֵּי־חָתָא	וְאֵת אֲרִידִי
	וְאֵת אֲדִלְיָא	וְאֵת וְזִידָתָא:

י עֶשְׂרֵת בְּנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ בֶּן הַמֶּדְתָּא צָרַר הַיְּהוּדִים הִרְגוּ וּבִבְזָה לֹא שִׁלְחוּ
אֶת יָדָם:

12. 11 בְּיוֹם הַהוּא בָּא מִסְפֵּר הַהֲרוּגִים בִּשְׁוֹשָׁן^א לִפְנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ: וַיֹּאמֶר
הַמֶּלֶךְ לְאַסְתֵּר הַמַּלְכָּה בִּשְׁוֹשָׁן^א הִרְגוּ הַיְּהוּדִים "חֲמֵשׁ מֵאוֹת אִישׁ
וְאֵת עֶשְׂרֵת בְּנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ בִּשְׁאֵר מְדִינוֹת הַמֶּלֶךְ מִהָ עָשׂוּ וּמִהָ
שָׂאֲלָתָךְ וַיִּנָּתֶן לָךְ וּמִהָ בְּקִשְׁתָּךְ עוֹד וַיַּעַשׂ:

13 וַתֹּאמֶר אֶסְתֵּר אִם עַל הַמֶּלֶךְ טוֹב יִנָּתֶן גַּם מִחַר לַיְּהוּדִים אֲשֶׁר
בִּשְׁוֹשָׁן לַעֲשׂוֹת כְּדַת הַיּוֹם וְאֵת עֶשְׂרֵת בְּנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ יִתְּלוּ עַל הָעֵץ:
14 וַיֹּאמֶר הַמֶּלֶךְ לַהֲעֲשׂוֹת כֵּן וַתִּנָּתֶן דָּת בִּשְׁוֹשָׁן וְאֵת עֶשְׂרֵת בְּנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ
תָּלוּ:

טו וַיִּקְהֲלוּ הַיְּהוּדִיִּים אֲשֶׁר בִּשְׁוֹשָׁן גַּם בְּיוֹם אַרְבַּעַה עָשָׂר לַחֹדֶשׁ
אֲדָר וַיִּהְרְגוּ בִּשְׁוֹשָׁן שְׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת אִישׁ וּבִבְזָה לֹא שִׁלְחוּ אֶת יָדָם:
16 וּשְׂאֵר הַיְּהוּדִים אֲשֶׁר בְּמְדִינוֹת הַמֶּלֶךְ נִקְהָלוּ וַעֲמָדָה עַל נַפְשָׁם {}
17 וַהֲרוּגִים בִּשְׁנֵאֵיהֶם חֲמִשָּׁה וּשְׁבַעִים אֶלֶף [] בְּיוֹם שְׁלוֹשָׁה עָשָׂר לַחֹדֶשׁ
אֲדָר [ז']? וְנֹחַח {} בְּאַרְבַּעַה עָשָׂר בּו וַעֲשָׂה אֲתוּ יוֹם מִשְׁתָּה וּשְׁמִחָה:
18 וַהֲיְהוּדִיִּים אֲשֶׁר בִּשְׁוֹשָׁן נִקְהָלוּ בְּשְׁלוֹשָׁה עָשָׂר בּו וּבְאַרְבַּעַה עָשָׂר
19 בּו וְנֹחַח בְּחִמְשָׁה עָשָׂר בּו וַעֲשָׂה אֲתוּ יוֹם מִשְׁתָּה וּשְׁמִחָה: עַל
כֵּן הַיְּהוּדִים הַפְּרוּזִים עָשִׂים אֶת יוֹם אַרְבַּעַה עָשָׂר לַחֹדֶשׁ אֲדָר
שְׁמִחָה וּמִשְׁתָּה יוֹם טוֹב וּמִשְׁלַח מְנוֹת אִישׁ לְרֵעֵהוּ:

כ וַיִּכְתֹּב מִרְדֵּכִי אֶת הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה וַיִּשְׁלַח סְפָרִים אֶל כָּל הַיְּהוּדִים
21 אֲשֶׁר בְּכָל מְדִינוֹת הַמֶּלֶךְ "הַקְּרוּבִים וְהַחֲחֻקִּים: לָקִים עֲלֵיהֶם
לַחַיּוֹת עָשִׂים אֶת יוֹם אַרְבַּעַה עָשָׂר לַחֹדֶשׁ אֲדָר וְאֵת יוֹם הַחֲמִשָּׁה

9, ה, וְהָרָג וְאַבְדָּן	(η)	6 הַבִּירָה	(θ)	וְאַבְדָּן	(ι)	11 הַבִּירָה	(κ)
12 הַבִּירָה	(λ)	וְאַבְדָּן	(μ)	16 וּבִבְזָה לֹא שִׁלְחוּ אֶת יָדָם	(ν)		
16 וְנֹחַח מֵאִיבֵיהֶם	(ξ)	19 הַיִּשְׁבִּים בְּעִרֵי הַפְּרוּזֹת	(ο)	9, כ, אַחֲשִׁירִי"ש	(π)		

- 8 האחשדרפנים והפחות ושרי המדינות אשר מהדו ועד כוש שבע
ועשרים ומאה מדינה מדינה ומדינה ככתבה ועם ועם כלשנו⁸;
י ויכתב בשם המלך ויחתם בטבעת המלך וישלח ספרים (ביד הרצים
11 "רכבי הרכש"⁹): אשר נתן המלך ליהודים אשר בכל עיר ועיר
להקהל ולעמוד על נפשם להשמיד ולהרג ולאבד את כל "עם
12 'מדינה' ומדינה הצר'רים אתם": ביום אחד בכל מדינות המלך;¹⁰
13 בשלושה עשר לחדש שנים עשר (הוא חדש אדר): פתשגן הכתב
(להפתח דת בכל מדינה ומדינה) גלוי לכל העמים ולהיות היהודיים
עת'דים ליום הזה להנקם מאיביהם:
14 טו הרצים לרכבי הרכש יצאו מ'ב'הלים": ומרדכי יצא מלפני המלך
בלבוש מלכות¹¹ חור¹² ויתכלת¹³ ותכריך¹⁴ בוץ וארגמן והעיר שושן
17. 16 צהלה": ליהודים היתה אורה ושמחה וששון ויקר: ובכל מדינה
ומדינה ובכל עיר ועיר מקום אשר דבר המלך ודתו מגיע שמחה
וששון ליהודים משתה ויום טוב ורבים מעמי הארץ מתייחדים
כי נפל פחד היהודים עליהם:
א, 9 ובשנים עשר חדש (הוא חדש אדר) בשלושה עשר יום בו אשר
2 הגיע דבר המלך ודתו להעשות¹⁵ ונהפוך הוא¹⁶: נקהלו היהודים
בעריהם בכל מדינות המלך¹⁷ לשלח יד במבקשי רעתם ואיש לא
3 עמד לפניהם¹⁸: וכל שרי המדינות והאחשדרפנים והפחות ועש'י
4 המלאכה אשר למלך מנשאים את היהודים¹⁹: כי גדול מרדכי בבית
ה המלך ושמעו הולך בכל המדינות²⁰: ויפו היהודים בכל איביהם

- (θ) 9, 8 ואל היהודים ככתבם וכלשונם (ι) ר, 8 אחש'ירש (κ) בסוסים
(λ) ר האחשתרנים²¹ (μ) 11 חיל (ν) טה ונשים ושללם לבוז
(ξ) 12 אחש'יר"ש (ο) 14 האחשתרנים
(π) ודתופים בדבר המלך ודתו נתנה בשושן הבירה
(ρ) טו ועטרת זהב גדולה
(α) א, 9 ביום אשר שפרו איבי היהודים לשלוט בהם
(β) אשר ישלטו²² המה בשנאיהם (γ) 2 אחש'יר"ש
(δ) 2 כי נפל פחדם על כל העמים (ε) 3 כי נפל פחד. מרדכי עליהם
(ς) 4 כי האיש מרדכי הולך וגדול

- ה, 7 ויאמר המלך^ב ז' לאסתר המלכה מי הוא זה ואי זה הוא אשר
 6 מל'א" לבו לעשות כן: ותאמר אסתר איש צר ואויב המן הרע
 7 הזה והמן נבעת מלפני המלך והמלכה: והמלך קם בהמתו
 ממשתה היין אל גפת הביתן והמן עמד לבקש על נפשו מאסתר
 8 המלכה כי ראה כי כלתה עליו הרעה מאת המלך: והמלך שב
 מגפת הביתן אל בית משתה היין והמן נפל על המטה אשר אסתר
 עליה ויאמר המלך הנהם לכבוש את המלכה עמי בבית הדבר
 יצא מפי המלך לפני המן הפרו:
 9 ויאמר הרבונה אחד מן הסריסים לפני המלך גם הנה העץ אשר
 עשה המן למרדכי אשר גמל' דבר טוב על המלך עמד בבית המן
 י גבה המשים אמה ויאמר המלך תלכו עליו: ויתלו את המן על
 העץ אשר הכין למרדכי וחמת המלך שככה:
 א, 8 ביום ההוא נתן המלך לאסתר המלכה את בית המן צרר
 היהודיים ומרדכי בא לפני המלך כי הגידה אסתר מזה הוא לה:
 2 ויסר המלך את טבעתו אשר העביר מהמן ויתנה למרדכי ותשם
 אסתר את מרדכי על בית המן:
 3 ותוסף אסתר ותדבר לפני המלך ותפל לפני רגליו ותתחנן
 4 לו להעביר את רעת המן הגא'גי^ב: ויושט המלך לאסתר את שרפט
 ה הזהב ותקם אסתר ותעמד לפני המלך: ותאמר אם על המלך טוב
 ואם מצאתי חן לפניו וכשר הדבר לפני המלך וטובה אני בעיניו
 יפתב להשיב את הספרים אשר כתב לאבד את היהודים אשר
 6 בכל מדינות המלך: כי איככה אוכל וראיתי באבדן מולדתי:
 7 ויאמר המלך לאסתר המלכה ולמרדכי היהודי הנה בית המן
 8 נתתי לאסתר ואחו תלו על העץ^ב: ואתם פתבו על היהודים
 כשוב בעיניכם בשם המלך והתמו בטבעת המלך כי כתב אשר
 נכתב בשם המלך ונתתם בטבעת המלך אין להשיב:
 9 ויקראו ספרי המלך בעת ההיא בחדש השלישי (הוא חודש סיון)
 בשלושה ועשרים בו ויכתב ככל אשר צוה מרדכי על היהודים אל

ה, 7, א אחש'ר"ש (ב) ויאמר (ג) א, 8 אחש'ר"ש

3 (ב) ואת מהשבתו אשר חשב על היהודים (ג) ה, 8 מחשבת המן בן הפרתא

6 (ב) איככה אוכל וראיתי ברעה אשר ימצא את עמי ו (ה'גא'גי

7 (א) אחש'ר"ש (ג) על אשר שלח ידו ביהודיים (ה) 9 ו

6, 3 ויאמר המלך מה נעשה יקר וגדולה למרדכי על זה ויאמרו
 4 נערי המלך משרתיו לא נעשה עמו דבר: ויאמר המלך מי בחצר
 (והמן בא א'ל חצר בית המלך החיצונה לאמר למלך לתלות את
 ה מרדכי על העץ אשר הכין לו): ויאמרו נערי המלך אליו הנה
 המן עמד בחצר ויאמר המלך יבוא:

6 ויבוא המן ויאמר לו המלך מה לעשות באיש אשר המלך
 חפץ ביקרו ויאמר המן בלבו למי יחפץ המלך לעשות יקר יותר
 8, 7 ממני: ויאמר⁶ אל המלך איש אשר המלך חפץ ביקרו: יביאו
 לבוש מלכות אשר לבש בו המלך וסוס אשר רכב עליו המלך {};
 9 ונתון הלבוש והסוס על יד איש משורי המלך הפרתמים והלבש⁷
 את האיש אשר המלך חפץ ביקרו {} והרכיבוהו על הסוס ברחוב
 העיר וקרא⁸ לפניו פכה יעשה לאיש אשר המלך חפץ ביקרו:

י ויאמר המלך להמן מהר קח את הלבוש ואת הסוס כאשר
 דברת ועשה כן למרדכי היהודי היושב בשער המלך אל תפל
 11 דבר מכל אשר דברת: ויקח המן את הלבוש ואת הסוס וילבש
 את מרדכי וירכיבוהו ברחוב העיר ויקרא לפניו פכה יעשה לאיש
 אשר המלך חפץ ביקרו:

12 וישב מרדכי אל שער המלך והמן נדחק אל ביתו אבל וחפוי
 13 ראש: ויספר⁹ לזרש אשתו ולכל אהביו את כל אשר קרהו ויאמרו
 לו חכמיו וזרש אשתו אם מוצרע היהודים מרדכי אשר החלות לנפל
 14 לפניו לא תוכל לו כי נפול תפול לפניו: עודם מדברים עמו וסריסי
 המלך הגיעו ויבהלו להביא את המן אל המשתה אשר עשתה
 אסתר:

א. 7, 2 ויבא המלך והמן לשותות עם אסתר המלכה: ויאמר המלך
 לאסתר¹⁰ במשתה היין מה שאלתך אסתר המלכה ותנתן לך ומה
 3 בקשתך עד חצי המלכות ותעש: ותען אסתר המלכה ותאמר
 אם מצאתי חן בעיניך המלך ואם על המלך טוב תנתן לי נפשי
 4 בשאלתי ועמי בבקשתי: כי נמכרנו אני ועמי להשמיד להרוג
 ולאבד ואלו לעבדים ולשפחות נמכרנו והרשתי כי אין הצר שוה
 בזק המלך:

(6) 6, 7 המן (6) 8 ונתן כתר מלכות בראשו (5) 13 המן (א) 2, 7 גם ביום השני

5, א ויהי ביום השלישי ותלבש אסתר מלכות ותעמד בחצר בית המלך הפנימית נכה בית המלך והמלך יושב על כסא מלכותו בבית המלכות נכה פתח הבית: ויהי כראות המלך את אסתר המלכה עומדת בחצר נשאה חן בעיניו ויושט המלך לאסתר את שרביט הזהב אשר בידו ותקרב אסתר ותגע בראש השרביט: ויאמר לה המלך מה לך אסתר המלכה ומה בקשתך: עד חצי המלכות ויפתן לך: ותאמר אסתר אם על המלך טוב יבוא המלך והמן היום אל המשתה אשר עשיתי לו: ויאמר המלך מהזרו את המן לעשות את דבר אסתר ויבא המלך והמן אל המשתה אשר עשתה אסתר:

6 ויאמר המלך לאסתר במשתה היין מה שאלתך ויפתן לך ומה בקשתך: עד חצי המלכות ותעש: ותען אסתר ותאמר שאלתי ובקשתי: (אם מצאתי חן בעיני המלך ואם על המלך טוב לתת את שאלתי ולעשות את בקשתי) יבוא המלך והמן אל המשתה אשר אעשה להם ומחר אעשה כדבר המלך: ויצא המן ביום ההוא שמה ושוב לב וכראות המן את מרדכי בשער המלך ולא קם ולא זע מפניו וימלא על מרדכי המה: ויתאפק⁸ ויבוא אל ביתו וישלח ויבא את אהביו ואת זרש אשתו: ויספר להם⁹ את כבוד עשרו ורוב בניו ואת {} אשר גדלו המלך ואת אשר נשאו על כל השרים ועבדי המלך: ויאמר¹⁰ אף לא הביאה אסתר המלכה עם המלך אל המשתה אשר עשתה כי אם אותי וגם למחר אני קרוא לה עם המלך: וכל זה איננו שוה לי בכל עת אשר אני ראה את מרדכי היהודי יושב בשער המלך: ותאמר לו זרש אשתו וכל אהביו יעשו עין גבה חמשים אמה ובפקר אמר למלך ויתלו את מרדכי עליו ובא עם המלך אל המשתה שמה ויישב הדבר לפני המן ויעש העץ:

6, א בלילה ההוא נדדה שנת המלך ויאמר להביא את ספר הזכרונות: ויהיו נקראים לפני המלך: וימצא כתוב אשר הגיד מרדכי על בגתנא ותרש שני סריסי המלך⁸ אשר בקשו לשלח יד במלך⁹:

5, 9 א המך (α) 5, ר המך (β) 11 המן (γ) 12 המן (δ) 6, א דברי הימים (α) 2 משמרי הסה (β) 7 אחשׁוֹרׁי״ר (γ)

- טו, 3 הרצים יצאו החופים בדבר המלך והדת נתנה בשושן הביירה והמלך והמן ישבו לשחות והעיר שושן נבוכה:
- א, 4 ומרדכי ידע את כל אשר נעשה ויקרע את בגדיו וילבש שק ואפר ויצא בתוך העיר ויזעק זעקה גדולה ומרה: ויבוא עד לפני שער המלך (כי אין לבוא אל שער המלך בלבוש שק): ובכל מדינה ומדינה מקום אשר דבר המלך ודחו מגיע אבל גדול ליהודים וגו' ובכי ומספד שק ואפר יציע לרבים:
- 4 ותבואינה נערות אסתר וסריסה ויגידו לה ותתחלחל המלכה מאד ותשלח בגדים להלביש את מרדכי ולהסיר שקו מעליו ולא קבל: ותקרא אסתר להתקד מסריסי המלך אשר העמיד לפניה ותצוהו אל מרדכי לדעת מה זה ועל מה זה: ויצא התקד אל מרדכי אל רחוב העיר אשר לפני שער המלך: ויגד לו מרדכי את כל אשר קרהו ואת פרשת הנסך אשר אמר המן לשקול אל גנזי המלך ביהודיים לאדם: ואת פתשגן כתב הדת אשר נתן בשושן להשמידם נתן לו להראות את אסתר ולהגיד לה ולצוות עליה לבוא אל המלך להתחנן לו ולבקש מלפניו על עמה: ויבוא התקד ויגד לאסתר את דברי מרדכי:
- י, 11 ותאמר אסתר להתקד ותצוהו אל מרדכי: כל עבדי המלך ועם מדינות המלך ידעים אשר כל איש ואשה אשר יבוא אל המלך אל החצר הפנימית אשר לא יקרא אחת דחו להמית לבד מאשר יושיט לו המלך את שרביט הזהב ויהי ואני לא נקראתי לבוא אל המלך זה שלושים יום:
13. 12 ויג'ד למרדכי את דברי אסתר: ויאמר מרדכי להשיב אל אסתר אל תדמי בנפשך להמלט בבית המלך מכל היהודים: כי אם תהרש תהריש בעת הזאת וְיָרָח והצלה יעמוד ליהודים ממקום אחר ואת בית אביך תאבדו ומי יודע אם לעת כזאת הגעת למלכות:
- טו, 16 ותאמר אסתר להשיב אל מרדכי: לך כנוס את כל היהודים הנמצאים בשושן וצומו עלי ואל תאכלו ואל תשתו שלשת ימים לילה ויום גם אני ונעלתי אצום כן ובכן אבוא אל המלך אשר לא כדת וכאשר אבדתי אבדתי:
- 17 ויעבר מרדכי ויעש ככל אשר צוהה עליו אסתר:

- א, 3 אחר הדברים האלה גדל המלך את המן [] וינשאהו וישם
 2 את כסאו מעל כל השורים אשר אהו: וכל עבדי המלך אשר
 בשער המלך פרעים ומשתחווים להמן כי כן צוה לו המלך ומרדכי
 3 לא יכרע ולא ישתחוה: ויאמרו עבדי המלך אשר בשער המלך
 4 למרדכי מדוע אתה עובר את מצות המלך: ויהי באמרו אליו
 יום ויום ולא שמע אליהם ויגידו להמן לראות היעמדו דברי
 ה מרדכי^א: וירא המן כי אין מרדכי פרע ומשתחוה לו וימלא
 6 חמה: ויבז בעיניו לשלח יד במרדכי לבדו { } ויבקש^ב להשמיד
 את כל [] היהודים { } אשר בכל מלכות אחשׁוֹרׁוֹשׁ []:
 8 ויאמר המן למלך "יִשְׁנֹה עִם אֶחָד מִפָּאָר וּמִפָּרֵד בֵּין הָעַמִּים
 בכל מדינות מלכותך ודחיהם שנות מכל עם ואת דתי המלך
 9 אינם עשים ולמלך אין שוה להפיהם: אם על המלך טוב יכתב
 לאבדם ועשרת אלפים כפר כסף אשקול על ידי עשי המלאכה
 י להביא אל גנזי המלך: ויסר המלך את טפעתו מעל ידו ויתנה
 11 להמן: ויאמר המלך להמן^ג העם^ד נתון^ה לך^ו, לעשות בו כשבו
 בעיניך:
 12 ויקראו ספרי המלך בחדש הראשון בשלושה עשר יום בו
 ייכתב ככל אשר צוה המן אל אחשדרפני המלך ואל הפחות אשר
 על מדינה ומדינה ואל שרי עם ועם מדינה ומדינה ככתבה ועם
 13 ועם כלשונו בשם המלך נכתב ונחתם בטבעת המלך: ונשלוח
 ספרים ביד הרצים אל כל מדינות המלך להשמיד להרג ולאבד
 את כל היהודים מנער ועד זקן טף ונשים ביום אחד בשלושה
 14 עשר לחדש שנים עשר (הוא חדש אדר^ז) ושללם לבז: פתשגן
 הכתב (להפתח דת בכל מדינה ומדינה) גלוי לכל העמים להיות
 עתידים ליום הזה:

(א) א, 3 אחשׁוֹרׁוֹשׁ (ב) 4 כי הגיד להם אשר הוא יהודי (ג) ה, 3 המן
 (ד) 6 המן (ה) עם מרדכי (ו) 5 כי הגיד לו את עם מרדכי (ז) 8 אחשׁוֹרׁוֹשׁ
 (ח) י בן המדתא ה'גא'ני צרר היהודים (ט) 11 4 ויהכסה (י) 12 אחשׁוֹרׁוֹשׁ
 (יא) 7 בחדש הראשון (הוא חדש ניסן) בשנת שתיים עשרה למלך^מ הפיל
 פור (הוא הגורל) לפני המן מיום ליום ומחדש לחדש ויפל הגורל
 על שלושה עשר לחדש שנים עשר (הוא חדש אדר):

- 2 ואת שבע הנערות הראיות {} וישנה ואת נערותיה לטוב בית
 י הנשים: (לא הגידה אסתר את עמה ואת מולדתה כי מירדכי צוה
 11 עליה אשר לא תגיד:) ובכל יום ויום מירדכי מתהלך לפני חצר
 בית הנשים לדעת את שלום אסתר ומה יעשה בה:
 12 ובהגיע תר נערה ונערה לבוא אל המלך⁹ מקץ היות לה כדת
 הנשים שנים עשר חדש (כי כן ימלאו ימי מרוקיהן ששה חדשים
 13 בשמן¹⁰ והמר וששה חדשים בבשמים ובתמרוקי הנשים): ובזה
 הנערה באה אל המלך את כל אשר תאמר ינתן לה לבוא עמה
 14 מבית הנשים עד בית המלך: בערב היא באה ובפקר היא שבה
 אל בית הנשים¹¹ (אל יד פִּעְשֶׁנֶזֶר סריס המלך שמר הפילגשים) לא
 תבוא עוד אל המלך כי אם הפִּץ בה המלך ונקראה בשם:
 טו ובהגיע תר אסתר¹² לבוא אל המלך לא בקשה דבר כי אם
 את אשר יאמר להי¹³ שמר הנשים ותהי¹⁴ נשאת הן בעיני כל
 16 ראייה: ותלקח¹⁵ אל המלך¹⁶ אל בית מלכותו בחדש העשירי (הוא
 17 חדש טבת) בשנת שבע למלכותו: ויאהב המלך את אסתר מכל
 הנשים ותשא¹⁷ הן וחסד לפניו מכל הבתולות וישם¹⁸ כתר מלכות
 18 בראשה וימליכה תחת ושתי: ויעש המלך משתה גדול לכל שריו
 ועבדיו¹⁹ והנחה למדינות²⁰ וייתן משאלת²¹ כיד המלך:
 21 בימים ההם ומירדכי יושב בשער המלך²² קצת פגתן ותירש שני
 22 סריסי המלך {} ויבקשו לשלח יד במלך²³: ויודע הדבר למירדכי
 23 ויגד²⁴ להמן [בן המדתא הגאלי] {משמרי הסת}: ויבקש הדבר
 וימצא ויתלו שניהם על עץ ויכתב בספר דברי הימים לפני המלך
 והמלך לא ידע כי מירדכי הגיד להמן:

(ז) 12, 2 אחשיר'ש (ה) 14 שני (θ) טו, 2 בת אביהיל דד מירדכי אשר לקח לו לבת
 (י) טו סריס המלך (κ) אסתר (λ) 16 אסתר (μ) אחשיר'ש
 (ν) 18 את משתה אסתר (ξ) עשה (ο) א. 10 וישם המלך²³ מס על הארץ ואי הים
 (π) 19 ובהקבץ בתולות²⁵ ומירדכי יושב בשער המלך: (ρ) 21 אחשיר'ש
 (σ) 22 לאסתר המלכה ותאמר אסתר למלך בשם מירדכי φ

(τ) א. 10 אחשיר'ש (ט) 2, 19 שנית
 (φ) כ, 2 אין אסתר מנדת מולדתה ואת עמה כאשר צוה עליה מירדכי
 ואת מאמר מירדכי אסתר עשה כאשר היתה באמנה אתו:

1, 16 ויאמר מ'מ'וכן לפני המלך והשרים לא על המלך לבדו עתה
 ושתי המלכה כי על כל השרים ועל כל העמים אשר בכל מדינות
 17 המלך: כי יצא דבר המלכה אל כל הנשים להבזות בעליהן
 בעיניהן באמרם המלך: אמר להביא את ושתי המלכה לפניו
 18 ולא באה: והיום הזה תאמרנה שרות פרס ומדי: לכל שרי המלך
 19 ו'בד' בזיון וקצף: אם על המלך טוב יצא דבר מלכות מלפניו
 ויפתב בדתי פרס ומדי ולא יעבור אשר לא תבוא ושתי לפני
 כ המלך: ומלכותה יתן המלך לרעותה הטובה ממנה: ונשמע פתגם
 המלך (אשר יעשה בכל מלכותו כי רבה היא) וכל הנשים יתנו
 יקר לבעליהן למגדול ועד קטן:
 21 וייטב הדבר בעיני המלך והשרים ויעש המלך כדבר ממוכן:
 22 וישלח ספרים אל כל מדינות המלך אל מדינה ומדינה ככתבה
 ואל עם ועם כלשונו להיות כל איש שׂוֹר בביתו:^א

2, א אחר הדברים האלה כשׁך חמת המלך: זכר את ושתי ואת אשר
 2 עשתה ואת אשר נגזר עליה: ויאמרו נערי המלך משׁרתיו יבקשו
 3 למלך נעיות בתולות טובות מראה: ויפקד המלך פקידים בכל
 מדינות מלכותו ויקבצו את כל נעיה בתולה טובת מראה אל
 4 שושן הבירה:^ב והנעיה אשר תיטב בעיני המלך תמלך תחת
 ושתי וייטב הדבר בעיני המלך ויעש כן:
 ה איש יהודי היה בשושן הבירה ושמו מרדכי (בן יאיר בן שׁמעי
 6 בן קיש): איש ימיני אשר הִגְלָה מירושלים עם הִגְלָה אשר
 7 הִגְלָה נבוכדנצר מלך בבל: ויהי אמן את הדסה (היא אסתר)
 בת דוד כי אין לה אב ואם והנערה יפת תאר וטובת מראה ובמות
 8 אביה ואמה לקחה מרדכי לו לבת: ויהי בהשמע דבר המלך
 ודתו ובהקבץ נעיות רבות אל שושן הבירה: ותלקח אל בית
 9 המלך אל יד הַגִּי שׁמר הנשים: ותיטב הנערה בעיניו ותשׂא חסד
 לפניו ויבהל את תמרודקה ואת מנותקת לתת לה: {מבית המלך}

1, 16 אהשׁי׳ר׳שׁ (ν) 17 אהשׁי׳ר׳שׁ (ε) 18 אשר שמעו את דבר המלכה
 19 אהשׁי׳ר׳שׁ (π) 22 ומדבר 'ב'לשון עמו (ρ) 2, א אהשׁי׳ר׳שׁ (α)
 2, 3 אל בית הנשים אל יד הַגִּי סרים המלך שׁמר הנשים ונתן תמרודקה
 6 אשר הִגְלָתה עם יכניה מלך יהודה (γ) 8 אל יד הגי (δ) אסתר (ε)

מגלת אסתר

- א, 1 ויהי בימי אחש'ר'ש"ש (הוא) המלך מהדו ועד כוש שבע ועשרים
 2 ומאה מדינה: ^ב כשבת המלך על כסא מלכותו אשר בשושן הבירה;
 3 בשנת שלוש למלכו עשה משתה לכל שריו ועבדיו ושרי חיל פרס
 4 ומדי הפרתמים ושרי המדינות לפניו: בהראתו את עשר כבוד
 מלכותו ואת יקר תפארת גדולתו ^ג שמונים ומאת יום;
 ה ובמל'א'ת הימים האלה עשה המלך לכל העם הנמצאים בשושן
 הבירה למגדול ועד קטן מש'ת'ה שבעת ימים בחצר גנת בי'ת'ן
 6 המלך: 'תחת' כר'פ'ס {} אחוז בחבלי {} 'תכלת' וארגמן על גלילי
 כסף ועמודי שש 'ב'משות' זהב וכסף על רצפת ב'הט' ושיש ודר
 7 וסחרת: והשקות בכלי זהב וכלים מ'פלים' שונים ויין מלכות רב
 8 כיד המלך: והשתיה כדת אין אנס כי כן יסד המלך על כל רב
 9 ביתו לעשות כרצון איש ואיש: גם ושתי המלכה עשתה משתה
 נשים 'ב'בית המלכות':
 י ביום השביעי כטוב לב המלך ביין אמר למהומן ב'זאת' הרב'נא
 ב'ג'ת'נ'א ^ה 'ת'רש' יתר וכר'פ'ס שבעת ה'פריסים' המ'שרתים' את פני
 11 המלך: להביא את ושתי המלכה לפני המלך בכתר מלכות
 12 להראות העמים והשרים את יפיה כי טובת מראה היא: ותמ'אן
 המלכה לבוא בדבר המלך אשר ביד ה'פריסים' ויקצק המלך
 13 נ'אד וחמתו בערה בו: ויאמר המלך לחכמים ידעי העתים (כי כן
 14 דבר המלך לפני כל ידעי דת ודין: ו'ה'קרב' אליו פ'רשנא' ש'תר
 א'ד'מ'תא תרשיש מ'רס מ'רסנא מ'מוכן' שבעת שרי פרס ומדי ראי
 טו פני המלך הישבים ראשנה במלכות | כדת? | מה לעשות במלכה
 על אשר לא עשתה את מאמר המלך " ביד ה'פריסים":

(α) א, 1 אחש'ר'ש"ש (β) 2 בימים ההם (γ) אחש'ר'ש"ש (δ) 4 ימים רבים
 (ε) 6 חור (ς) בוך (η) 9 אשר למלך σσ (θ) י, 1 ואב'ג'תא (ι) אחש'ר'ש"ש
 (κ) 12 ושתי (λ) טו, 1 ושתי (μ) אחש'ר'ש"ש
